The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

NEVER before in human history has the choice of life or death, the blessing or the curse, been set so certainly before mankind as now by the new powers that nuclear science has put into our hands. No special responsibility rests upon the scientists themselves. It has long been accepted that man should have dominion and subdue the earth; that his search for knowledge should be pressed outward in all directions into the darkness that surrounds the still small, but ever-widening, circle of light. With knowledge comes power, and with power responsibility. It is in the apprehension and discharge of the new responsibilities that present failure is so evident. We need all the help we can get.

* * *

There have been eras when a closed system of belief and the clearly defined duties that follow from it have been held to be more reverent to God and safer for man than the exploration of the unknown. The Church built its walls to keep contamination out, and to keep its children in. The unknown was an enemy till it proved itself a friend. But it was given little opportunity of doing so. Whatever view we take of the Renaissance and the Reformation —and we are now being taught to think of them not as the sudden explosions of intellectual and spiritual energy but rather as periods of acceleration in developments which had been proceeding for centuries—they represent the breaking down of imprisoning walls and fresh impulses to exploration in all directions which have brought us to where we now find ourselves, bewildered by the truth and afraid of its consequences. But the new impulse of this present century is so mighty that it may seem to future ages—if indeed there are any—much more like a new beginning than a development of what has preceded it.

When Rutherford first described in public his mysterious experiments in which he had succeeded in 'splitting the atom' he warned his hearers that he was dealing with affairs which for a very long time would be confined to the laboratories of a few physicists; we were to dismiss from our minds any thoughts of new, practically-useful sources of energy. That was only thirty years

ago. Those remote experiments have now given us the power of life and death over the whole earth.

* * *

In the week in which these notes are written Mr. Lewis Straus, chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, announced the results of its observations and calculations of the vast area of destruction resulting from a nuclear explosion—it is greater than had been anticipated—and the British Government issued a White Paper setting out plans for building twelve nuclear power stations during the next ten years, and pointing to the more distant day when the atom will be a cheaper and more plentiful source of energy than coal.

> I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse; therefore choose life that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed. . . .

These dramatic words are no longer to be dismissed as merely ancient prophecy or preacher's rhetoric. They are charged as never before with real and tremendous meaning. Lord Russell has written a letter to *The Manchester Guardian* to say that if a major war is allowed to break out about Formosa the human race may be obliterated before the end of this year! If it is unlikely, it is not impossible.

* * *

The possibility of disaster is so near that there are those who say that the Inquisition was right in condemning Galileo. The curiosity of man is too dangerous to be unfettered. The only hope of mankind is to find refuge in a walled city wherein we may work and play in security. A nostalgia for the Middle Ages, the so-called Age of Faith, is widespread. In some the hope is for a revival of authoritarian religion; others flee into the protective custody of dialectical materialism and the rigid social system that arises out of it. To many people the issue seems to present itself as an either or—either authoritarian Christianity or authoritative materialism, the Kremlin or the Vatican. If indeed that is the choice before us, if these are the only alternatives, then the battle is already lost. Freedom is dead; responsibility rests only with the Pope or Stalin's successor, whoever he may prove to be, and obedience is the only virtue. We cannot even follow Voltaire's advice to cultivate our gardens, except under the direction of those who will tell us what to plant and determine the percentage of our crops we may appropriate to our own use.

* * *

They tell us, of course, that they do it for our own good. We are not to be trusted to make our own lives and work out our own

salvation. But who desires to "live in the pauperdom of their charity," as MacNeile Dixon indignantly demands. And he goes on, ". . . the last and greatest insult you can offer to the human race is to regard it as a herd of cattle to be driven to your selected pasture. . . . Every type of compulsion is hateful; always has been and always will be, as long as men are men. . . . Why have men fought for liberty? Not for amusement. Freedom they must have, whether they know what to do with it or not, freedom to choose cause or party, order or disorder, the good or the bad, to steer each his own vessel to the port of his desire."

This is held by some to be no more than the expression of an out-dated liberalism. But the authoritarians are more contemptuous of liberalism in words than in action. In action they are not contemptuous but cruel. This out-dated liberalism must not be allowed to speak for itself. It must be repressed by fear, the fear of death or of hell, or of both.

* * *

It is this fundamental distrust of the human spirit that condemns all authoritarian systems. Our Lord refused to win the kind of success that comes with the domination of men. His limitless powers were never used to intimidate the simple or even the hostile. He offered Himself for our acceptance. He would not call down fire from heaven nor summon legions of angels. Being lifted up He would draw all men unto Him. And lest His friends should become too dependent upon Him, it was expedient that He should go away. Hardly less impressive than His faith in God was His faith in men, even those who forsook Him in the hour of need, and those who spat upon Him in the hour of humiliation and jeered at Him as He died.

If sometimes it seems to us that the price of freedom is too high, then it is well to remember what price Jesus was ready to pay for His own and ours, and spare more than a passing thought on those millions of our fellow men who have yet to learn what freedom is, and those other millions who in our time have lost it.

* * *

The Twentieth Century recently published an interesting Cambridge number, in which eleven members of the University express their uneasy concern not only at the revival of organized religion which they perceive but also at the movement towards authority of other kinds. They are atheists, says Mr. E. M. Forster in an introductory letter, but they are Humanists. Their hope is in the spirit of man, and they have no other. They are aware of the grave problems that surround us, and they are compassionate lovers of their fellow men. But they have no answer to the child who asked, Why should I be good when I want to be naughty? and

they seem less concerned than they might be with the man into whom that child grows up. But they are sure the remedy for "the troubles of our proud and angry dust" does not lie in the revival of authority. The revival of religion, in so far as it exists, seems to them to be the search for a refuge from the responsibilities of decision and action in a difficult time, and as such, indeed, some forms of religion are offered and accepted. Mr. M. J. C. Hogart, however, thinks "there is no evidence that religion in the strict sense is reviving" but his tests and definitions are his own. It is surely perverse of him to say, "It is unsatisfactory to define Christianity other than as the total practices of the Roman Catholic Church (and perhaps of its fellow-travellers among the High Anglicans); anything less rigorous will admit under the name of religion an immense variety of practices with a varying amount of belief in the supernatural right down to Matthew Arnold's notorious minimum definition, 'morality touched with emotion'. If we are to talk about religion as anything more than a vague impulse to do good then we must talk about it in terms of a body of believers and a body of priests invested with spiritual power; otherwise it becomes, like Liberalism or vegetarianism, simply a philosophical trend shared by an amorphous group of sympathizers." Thus is dismissed the whole of Protestant Christianity, which is, surely, no more 'amorphous' than the Humanism which is here expounded.

* * *

An editorial note is no place to embark upon an exposition and apology for liberal Christianity. Let us however say that there are those who have lived and worked and died in the faith that Jesus Christ is the sufficient revelation of the character and purpose of God; that His gospel lays upon men the splendid, but awful, responsibility of choosing good where they might choose evil; and assures them that there is that in man which not accident nor treachery nor cruelty nor any of the vicissitudes of mortality can dispatch to oblivion. It is a faith by which to live and in which to die. It binds together a great body of believers who are in no wise dependent upon "a body of priests invested with spiritual power."

But we must not leave an impression only of disagreement with the main tenor of these witty and erudite papers. There was a scribe of whom Jesus said, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. These that are not against Him are, in some part, with Him.

* * *

Those who know Konrad Lorenz's *King Solomon's Ring* will hasten to read, indeed to buy, his new book, *Man Meets Dog* (Methuen, 15s.). The earlier volume is known as one of the most charming, amusing and learned studies of bird and animal behaviour ever written. This second book is a more specialized

study of dogs and cats. There is the same patience and insight, the same wit and sense of fun, the same astonishing friendships with the animals he has lived with. We are all the while being shown things that can be known only to a lover of animals who is also probably the best animal psychologist of our time. Not all his scientific theories will be immediately accepted, and those we are not qualified to discuss, but we cordially recommend you to meet Dr. Lorenz and his menagerie. The book is beautifully translated and illustrated with numerous marginal line drawings as good as the text. It is admirably produced.

THE WORLD AT LARGE

In 1933 Hitler came to power in Germany. He represented extremist nationalism, yet he claimed to express in his policy a *positives Christentum*. A number of Christians wholeheartedly accepted the Revolution. They were prepared to interpret Christianity in terms of nationalism, of Blood and Soil. They were called 'German Christians'. By a trick election they got control of the machinery of the Protestant Church; they handed over to Hitler the Church's Youth Work and thereafter the State controlled the Church till the fall of Hitler. Most decent churchmen did not like it at all; but they had no wish to be in political opposition; there never quite came the right time when they felt they must protest; besides, protest meant Concentration Camp and probable death. These were the neutrals, *die neutralen*. A few said No. Their very heroic leader was Martin Niemöller. The occasion for their first decisive No was the famous 'Aryan paragraph' which required the Church to accept the racial heresy of the regime and insisted that Christians not of pure Aryan descent should be segregated from the rest. Martin Niemöller was a great hero in Britain, and we of the Congregational tradition, in particular, liked to think of him as of the same breed as our fathers.

* * *

Twenty-one years later Mr. Strydom came to power in the Union of South Africa. The parallels are disquieting—and so also are the differences. Like Hitler he would certainly claim a Christian basis for the policy of his government. The largest Protestant Church in the Union supports him and is committed to interpreting Christianity, not indeed in terms of Blood and Soil, but in terms of racial domination, which is the same thing under another name. There can in South Africa be no trick Church election, but there is at once that which corresponds to the 'Aryan paragraph', namely, the Bantu Education Act.

In 1946 (I have no later figures) there were 4,335 mission schools, State-aided, and 232 Government schools for the Bantus. By the new Act education is taken wholly out of the hands of the churches and put under the complete control of the State. Why? Because the churches cannot be trusted to teach the Bantu that his place in South Africa is to leave government to the whites and to do the less skilled jobs. Let me quote from the Minister for Native Affairs who, rather than the Minister of Education, is to have complete and autocratic control of native schools: "There is no place for him [the Bantu] in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour"; "the School must equip him [the Bantu] to meet the demands which the economic life of South Africa will impose on him." The education given by the churches is no longer to be endured because it is not based on ideas of white domination.

* * *

The issue, be it observed, is not the policy of *Apartheid;* it is the determination of the South African Government to build a national order based on white domination, precisely as Hitler sought to build a national order on the principles of German Blood and Soil. The question is much more than an administrative political issue. It goes down to the nature of the Gospel which is entrusted to the Church. It is, too, but the first step in a campaign; for, as a circular to local authorities has stated, churches in locations must apply annually for the right to remain there. The churches, in fact, are to serve the Bantu just so long as the Government approves of them, and no longer.

Some Christians have seen the signs of the times and uttered their uncompromising NO. And who are they? Fr. Huddlestone, the Bishop of Johannesburg, the Anglo-Catholics and, I believe, the Romanists. "The policy of the Bantu Education Act," said the Bishop of Johannesburg, "is morally indefensible. In conscience I am bound to oppose it, and therefore cannot assist the Government, however remotely or indirectly, in implementing a policy which violates Christian standards."

* * *

The South African Government has requested the churches to let it have the use of the church school buildings to implement the racial policy. The Congregationalists, the Methodists, the Presbyterians have passed some inexpensive and unexceptionable resolutions, but they are going to hand their work over to Mr. Strydom and Dr. Verwoerd. Local people may be acting under local pressures which I do not understand. I know too little of South Africa, but since my childhood two great institutions have always been familiar to me as outstanding pieces of British missionary

work, Lovedale of the Church of Scotland and Tigerkloof of the L.M.S. These two great institutions are to be tamely handed over by the Church of Scotland and the L.M.S. And I do not know how to comment. I feel like a Rip van Winkle suddenly awakening to a world he does not understand, or rather like a boy who sees his honoured father in dishonour.

* * *

What could we have done? We could have said NO, and told Mr. Strydom he could send his police to close the places down or to seize them if he dared. And there is certainly no reason why he should not dare. For the voice of Gladstone which, when I was a boy, was touching the conscience of the nation about Armenia has long been silenced and John Clifford is gone and the gallant band that marched with him, and the old Nonconformity is gone, and the gift of prophecy has passed to the Anglo-Catholics, and the blessing of God be with them! We Congregationalists do not like what is happening but we must now be reckoned amongst the great majority, *die neutralen,* what a name for the sons of our fathers!

* * *

But wait a minute! Rhetoric is no substitute for argument, and am I not about to give myself the lie direct when I come now to write of the church in Czechoslovakia? Let us suspend judgment for a moment!

In Czechoslovakia there would seem to be a fundamental difference between the approach of the Protestants and that of the Roman Catholics to the Communist regime. The attitude of Rome to Communism is one of sheer negation; Communism is the common enemy; with atheist Communism there can be no compromise. The collision is head on! I am not in the least surprised that Communists should regard Roman Catholics as a Fifth Column behind the Iron Curtain. The judgment may not be fair, but the Vatican has given much excuse for it. The Protestants, led by the very faithful and gallant Dr. Hromadka, have taken a quite different line. They have said, in effect, "We are not Communists; Christianity is not tied to any one economic order, and the materialist philosophy of Communism is not ours. But we accept the government of our country; we are not, and we will not be, a political opposition, a Fifth Column. Communism on its ideal side points to a great and splendid revolution in human history, to the end of the ages of privilege, to the ordering of the common life in the interests of the common man. There is bound to be much done that we shall not like and, of course, the point may always arise where, as Christians, we shall have to say No and take the consequences, but we are of opinion that the new order of society

which we are now trying to build up in our land will be a far better expression of justice, it will, in fact, be a more 'Christian' order than we have known in the past or seen in the Capitalist countries of the West. We mean whole-heartedly, so far as we can, to play our part; we do not want to be 'liberated' by the West, and we hope and pray that we may be kept loyal to Jesus Christ and may not refuse suffering in His cause if that should come to us through our loyalty. Something like this is, I think, their case.

* * *

It seems to me that Dr. Hromadka and his companions walk, as it were, on a razor's edge; there must often be for them the most agonizing decisions as to whether or not here they must accept or here they must protest and take the consequences. We do not know the end of the story yet, and surely no Christians more need to be constantly upheld by the intercessions of the Universal Church. But I submit that they are right in the line that they have taken. So far they seem to have achieved a *modus vivendi* in a Communist regime; the Church has not been driven into the catacombs, and the Church has, I believe, been faithful.

* * *

Am I not, then, guilty of a manifest inconsistency? How can I write so fiercely, so very nearly tearfully, about the compromises in South Africa and at the same time justify the compromises in Czechoslovakia?

Well, of course, in either case or in both, I may be wrong. That is the first thing to be said. The reader must judge of that. But I see clear differences. The Protestants in Czechoslovakia are prepared to work with the atheist secular Government so far as they can, because of their hope and belief, misplaced possibly, but genuine and intelligible, that their country, through its Government, is aiming at an economic order more brotherly, more just, more 'Christian' than the economic order of past Western capitalism, whereas in the case of South Africa the Government is aiming at an order of society which is in direct and open contradiction of the Gospel as we understand it. Moreover, the Church in Czechoslovakia is the Church under the Cross; it walks in daily loyalty and daily peril. That is not true of the Church in South Africa or in Britain. On the one side, therefore, I see a daring loyalty and on the other a great betrayal, the consequences of which for Africa and for British Nonconformity cannot be foreseen. N. M.

IS THERE A SPECIAL AFFINITY BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND DEMOCRACY?

By JOHN C. BENNETT, M.A., D.D.[1]

Is there any kind of political structure which Christians as Christians should prefer to all others? It has become a commonplace that there is no Christian economic system, that every attempt to identify Christianity with capitalism or socialism is wrong. Is the same thing true of political systems? No particular political institutions as they exist in any country can be given unqualified sanction in terms of Christian faith. Yet there are many of us who think that there may be a special affinity between Christianity and the intentions of political democracy. In Britain and U.S.A. such a view would be quite generally accepted. But it is striking that a theologian who has always been most critical of any confusion between Christianity and human cultures and institutions, Karl Barth, should cautiously admit that there is a real affinity between Christianity and democracy. He writes, 'There is no reason, however, why it should be overlooked or denied that Christian choices and purposes in politics tend on the whole toward the form of state which, if it is not actually realized in the so-called 'democracies,' is at any rate more or less honestly clearly intended and desired.''[2]

Is not Barth, a citizen of an old democracy, and are not we in Britain and America who agree with him, merely falling into the error that has beset Christians in all countries and in all generations, namely, that of giving a Christian sanction to aspects of one's own culture? I believe that the answer is "no"; but it is not an obvious answer either in view of Christian history or in view of the alternatives which many countries seem to confront today.

It is necessary, first, to explain what I mean by 'democracy' in this article. It is an ambiguous word depending on how much

[1]This paper under the title "Christianity in its Social Setting" appears in "Religion in Life" and is printed here by arrangement.—Ed.

[2]Barth, K., *Against the Stream,* Philosophical Library, 1954, p. 44. In an earlier book Barth was more decisive in linking Christianity with democracy. He wrote, "When I consider the deepest and most central content of the New Testament exhortation, I should say that we are justified, from the point of view of exegesis, in regarding the 'democratic conception of the state' as a justifiable expansion of the thought of the New Testament." (*Church and State,* p. 80.) I emphasize Barth here only because of all modern theologians he is the one who has made the most of the dangers of identifying Christianity with any cultural forms or social structures.

emphasis is placed on the will of the majority. This ambiguity is seen in the contrast between Anglo-Saxon democracy and the democracy of the French Revolution; today there is a similar ambiguity in the use of the word in the Communist and non-Communist worlds. The root of the ambiguity is in the way in which the will of the majority is related to constitutional defences for the minority and to fundamental rights of the individual. The only kind of democracy which is worth defending is one that is constitutional, which recognizes the danger of unchecked majority rule. A democracy that does not protect the right and the power of the minority to organize, to challenge and displace the majority of the moment is almost certain to vote itself into a tyranny from which it may be impossible to escape by democratic methods.

Professor Hallowell in his fine study of *The Moral Foundation of Democracy* makes this point and emphasizes the fact that it is in accordance with the political wisdom of Plato and Aristotle. Democracy had a bad name with them because it was associated with unchecked majority rule. Hallowell quite rightly says, "The constitutional, representative democracy which the framers of our [American] Constitution established bears considerable resemblance to that form of government which Aristotle described as a 'polity' and which he regarded as the best practicable of all constitutions."[3]

When I use the word 'democracy' here, I have in mind a type of political structure which is characterized by two things: (1) government based upon the consent of and participation in by all groups of the people; (2) constitutional safeguards of freedom of expression by all persons and the right of minorities to organize politically. But these political elements in a society are not self-sufficient. Whether they can be made to work or not depends upon many non-political factors such as the existence of a measure of consensus in the nation as a whole and the maintenance of checks and balances in the economic as well as the political sphere.

This right of all groups of the people to participate in government means that there should be no part of the population that is governed by the rest of the population without its consent. It does not mean that there should be no qualifications for voting that are applied to the individual, but these qualifications should not be so designed that they disfranchise any continuing racial or social group in the nation. The reason why universal suffrage is necessary in a democracy is that any group that does not have as much political power as this will be neglected or exploited by the other groups. In the Southern states of America we have a kind of laboratory in which the disabilities which accompany the absence of political

[3]Hallowell, J. H., *The Moral Foundation of Democracy*, University of Chicago Press, 1954, p. 109.

rights in the case of the Negro minority (sometimes even majority) could be readily observed. In recent years great advances have been made all along the line, including the attainment of the right to vote on the part of the minority. There has been a widespread assumption in other periods that the right to vote should depend upon the possession of a certain amount of property. This was supposed to guarantee that the voter would be responsible, that he would have a stake in the stability of social institutions. But if this means the permanent disfranchisement of a portion of the population, the problems which bear hardest on those people will be neglected. One of the remarkable developments in modern political history is that the logic of democracy has forced the classes which had the advantage of limited suffrage to yield that advantage, so that today universal suffrage is the rule in democratic countries.

Unless these two elements are combined we do not have a form of democracy which is at all defensible from the Christian point of view. It would not be democracy at all without universal suffrage or at least a clear movement in the direction of universal suffrage. But, without the constitutional protections of freedom which limit the power of the majority, whatever democracy there may be is likely to be destroyed by the propaganda and the skilful manoeuvres of popular political movements.

When there is need to give priority to either of these two elements in democracy, it would be more prudent to emphasize the rule of law and the constitutional safeguards of freedom than to move immediately to the ultimate in popular government. But the chance to do this no longer exists in many countries. The older democracies have long ago established universal suffrage (though the men of Switzerland regularly go to the polls to deny the vote to the other half of the population), and such new nations as India and Pakistan have moved to universal suffrage immediately. The risk here may be very great. However, the temporary withholding of the suffrage from any group would give a strong propaganda advantage to the enemies of democracy on the left. If one were to insist on literacy as a qualification for the suffrage, there is some question how much more secure a nation would be, since it is the most literate section of the population that is most easily swayed by Communist teaching![4]

Instead of presenting a direct argument in favour of the affinity between Christianity and democracy, I shall deal in this article with four major problems or difficulties I often encounter in discussions of this subject. Any judgment that we make about the

[4]Neither the World Council Assembly of Churches at Amsterdam nor that at Evanston stressed the word "democracy"; but the concept of "The Responsible Society," which both Assemblies set forth as involving goals for all Christians, includes the essential elements in democracy as set forth in this article. See the Amsterdam Report (Section III) and the Evanston Report (Section III).

relation between Christianity and democracy depends upon the way in which we deal with these problems.

I

A first difficulty is that historically there has been no necessary connection between Christianity and democracy. If we were to suggest a form of the State which has in the past seemed most congenial to the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, it would probably be some kind of constitutional aristocracy. Both Thomas Aquinas and Calvin, in spite of the great differences in their influence, would have agreed on that. Luther was much less of a democrat than either of them. G. P. Gooch has said that democracy is a child of the Reformation but not of the Reformers, and we may add that it is a child of Methodism but not of Wesley. Christian history does not naturally lead to the judgment that there is an affinity between Christianity and democracy. Professor James Nichols in his illuminating and provocative book, *Democracy and the Churches*,[5] shows that only a particular form of Protestantism, what he calls Puritan Protestantism, has provided strong spiritual support for political democracy. Under Puritan Protestantism he includes both the Calvinistic tradition and the sectarian wing of Protestantism. He recognizes that Anglicanism, while not originally inclined toward democracy, has become favourable to it, and that Scandinavian Lutheranism is a problem in itself because it has had such a different social influence from that of German Lutheranism. But neither Eastern Orthodoxy nor Roman Catholicism has proved to be favourable to the development of democracy where it has had a religious monopoly.

I have used Professor Nichols's analysis only to give emphasis to the historical difficulty in thinking of an essential connection between Christianity and democracy. His analysis is defensible only when we ask about the religious influences which have been effective in those societies which have been notably successful in making democratic institutions work for a considerable period. The analysis should be accompanied by a clear recognition of the fact that democratic ideas have received classic expression and have been embodied (within limits) in ancient Greece, and that secular rationalism and humanitarianism (dependent in part on Christianity) have often made an essential contribution to the development of democracy. Also, the Catholic tradition has been the bearer of conceptions of law and of constitutional government which are inherited by Protestantism and by modern democracy. We should certainly avoid the fatalistic assumption that, in the future, nations must be Protestant if they are to be democratic.

Why should Christians now be concerned to support and extend

[5]Nichols, J., *Democracy and the Churches*, Westminster Press, 1951.

democracy when so much Christian history is on the other side? I shall suggest a way of answering that question.

There have always been elements in Christian teaching which have pointed the way to democracy, but in many cultural situations their significance has not been clearly revealed. Today, the movement of events and the sharpening of alternatives have enabled the democratic elements in Christianity to stand out more clearly. I shall mention three elements in Christianity which taken together have democratic implications, and then I shall call attention to some of the external changes which have forced our generation to see these implications more clearly than has been the case with previous generations. No one of these three elements in Christianity points to democracy very clearly by itself. All of them must be taken together. The first is the sovereignty of God as transcending all of the authorities and powers of the world. The second is God's love for all persons regardless of their status in society. The third is the doctrine of sin, which warns us against any political system which allows anyone to have arbitrary, unchecked power over others.

The sovereignty of God, whether recognized or not, is the ultimate guarantee of the right and duty of the person to claim for himself and his neighbours the kinds of freedom which a democratic constitution protects. If there is no love or compassion which continually seeks to raise up the poor and defenceless and the disadvantaged to a position where they can develop their human capacities and maintain their just rights, and if there is no stress upon the sin which accompanies all forms of power, faith in God's sovereignty may not be democratic at all in its effects. It may give divine sanction to a small group who claim to be the beneficiaries of God's providence, or who convince themselves and others that they have inside knowledge of God's will. The combination of the Christian understanding of God's love which knows no favoured class—unless it be those who have been lost or in a special way neglected—and the application of the doctrine of sin to the respectable and the powerful correct any such perversion of Christian faith in the divine sovereignty.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr in his discussion of Christianity and democracy has shown clearly that there is a delicate balance in the way Christian convictions should be held. There is a kind of Christian pessimism which can be used to defend the most autocratic form of power because the order that exists is regarded as preferable to the wild disorder that is feared if those in power lose their grip and the people win control over their own destiny. There is also a kind of Christian optimism which easily believes that, if some new group gains power, there will be no moral risk. This is the great fallacy of revolutionary Utopianism which Niebuhr has

been criticizing so profoundly for twenty years. The Christian understanding of the human situation is wonderfully expressed in Niebuhr's famous epigram about democracy: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."[6]

I have referred to external changes which make it easier for our generation to see the democratic implications of Christian truth than it was for our predecessors. I have two changes in mind. The first is the mere fact of social upheaval, which has deprived ancient hierarchical structures of their majesty. The new structures have acquired no such majesty and it is not possible to believe that God ordained them to remain as they are for all time. The conservative effects of certain ideas of divine providence which were used to give religious sanction to the *status quo* are no longer a serious factor in many countries. This change is not in all respects a gain, for the traditional authoritarian societies were often more humane than the modern tyrannies, but it does prevent one misuse of religion.

The other change is closely related to the first. It is the fact that today, on all sides, the people who have been the objects of a well-intentioned paternalism, which often provided an excuse for undemocratic forms of power, have become articulate and they can talk back to those who have held the power. Again, there have been losses as well as gains when this change has come too fast, but it does clear the air of a lot of nonsense that has been used in defence of despotism, imperialism, white supremacy, and the unchecked power of employers. Today the alternatives to democracy do not stand up well. Those that were to some extent benevolent have lost their moral defences. The thoroughly consistent tyrannies have become so intolerable that we can always begin with the assumption that, whatever is true in this whole field, such tyrannies are a clear offence against God and man.

II

Christians who live in countries where there has been no democratic experience in the past, where the particular traditions which have nourished democracy in the West have not been influential, must necessarily raise the question whether democracy is a viable alternative for their countries. This may be true in many Latin American countries, which have democratic constitutions modelled after our own, but have not been able to make these constitutions work. It may be true in most of the countries of Asia, especially Japan with its feudal tradition, but also in such new countries as India, Pakistan, Burma, and Indonesia. In all of these countries the lack of a deeply rooted tradition which is favourable

[6]Niebuhr, R., *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1944, p. xi.

to democracy is only a part of the difficulty. Equally important are the overwhelming national problems, which may not yield to slow democratic remedies. It is often necessary to face squarely the argument of those who believe that their nations would probably benefit in the long run from a Communist-inspired revolution.

The problem raised by these countries, which make up so large a part of the human race, is for me the most difficult in this whole context. There is not much difficulty about ultimate goals. What has been said about the claims of the two aspects of democracy mentioned above applies to these countries as much as it does to any others. Whatever words may be used, anything less than government based upon the consent of and participation in by the people and constitutional safeguards for freedom is not good enough for any nation. Yet, there is ahead of these countries a very difficult and hazardous period. How will they find for themselves alternatives to totalitarian tyranny? Great eagerness to export to them an American or even a generally Western pattern of government may be self-defeating. Often the spiritual roots of democracy which have proved to be essential in the West are largely lacking in the culture. This is a serious problem, but it should not cause us to speak in a fatalistic vein. There is ground for real encouragement in the development so far in India, and the Philippines, and perhaps other nations.

There is one alternative to democracy on the one hand and to totalitarianism on the other; that is, at best, a benevolent authoritarian government of the traditional type, that does not attempt to control the minds of the people because it has no orthodoxy to communicate and, at worst, an authoritarian government which out of sheer inefficiency makes room for a considerable margin of freedom. Where such governments exist they are certainly to be preferred to an intolerant and efficient tyranny. It is quite impossible to plan for such a government, and when a society becomes self-conscious about it, one has great difficulty in defending it. It has a certain value as long as it works with reasonable effectiveness and moderation. In the propaganda war it doesn't have much chance. Also, in the face of the complexities of an industrialized society, it is likely to be incompetent. In fact, it is not likely to survive in any country that does not have a considerable measure of agricultural prosperity.

Wherever there is a self-conscious type of benevolent authoritarian government, as in the case of some colonial régimes in Africa, the only way to defend it is to show that it is honestly trying to prepare the people for self-government. In these borderline situations, Christians may often be wise in not forcing issues, and in working for quite specific economic and social goals, without

insisting on an immediate advance toward political democracy. Openness to the concrete possibilities in a situation should certainly modify our commitment to democracy as a goal for society. I do not mean that Christians should complacently accept the *status quo,* but rather that they should avoid a kind of abstract devotion to democratic principles, which blinds them to the real situation in which they live.

What should we say about the temptation of many idealists, some of them sincere Christians, to assume that the problems of their country are so desperate that nothing short of Communism as a remedy will suffice? They may believe that no political movement other than Communism is able to get results in terms of overcoming government corruption or in terms of land reform. Usually those who think in this way have never had their eyes opened to the nature of international Communism. An indigenous Communist movement in India would be one thing, but why should India's problems have to be solved by subordinating the destiny of India to the world programme of Russia or China? There is no small danger that the very national independence, which India prizes so highly, would be lost if India became Communist.

Even more important, there is the price that must be paid in the control of the culture, of the minds and souls of large sections of the population. The brain-washing technique and the indoctrination of a whole generation with anti-religious and materialistic teaching represent a price that is too great to pay. The difficulty is that people in so many countries do not really learn about the nature of that price until it is too late. Even if there is evidence today, as suggested by Harrison Salisbury's articles in *The New York Times* (September and October, 1954), that Communism in Russia has become less oppressive since the death of Stalin, that the original Communist fanaticism has cooled off to some extent, the fact that it took more than three decades to arrive at this very slight, and still ambiguous, improvement should not be of great comfort to a nation that now contemplates beginning a career of Communism.

I should not say these things, however, without recognizing the dilemma of the Christian who becomes sincerely convinced that there is no effective alternative to Communism if his country is to overcome centuries of an unjust feudal land system, or if his country is to organize itself soon to cope with the problem of poverty and hunger. It is very easy for us to say that he is wrong, but our alternatives are so different from his. His final answer to us may be that he has faith that Communism will pass in a generation and that after it passes it will leave a residue of social reform which could come in no other way now in sight. I may think that he has been

somewhat sheltered from the cruelty and the fanaticism of Communism, from its capacity to distort the mind, but unless I see that his dilemma is a real one, I become incapable of understanding the spiritual problem of many thoughtful Christians, especially in Asia and in South America.

Apart from the special problems of social injustice which cause people to be tempted by Communism, there is the more general problem of order, of having any government at all that can prevent anarchy and overcome stalemates between groups within a nation. There is a strong emphasis in the Christian tradition on the primary claim of order because of Christian realism concerning the effect of sin upon society. There are times when any order may be better than sheer anarchy. This is especially true in a complicated interdependent society where anarchy soon means starvation. And yet we cannot allow this truth to stand alone. Christian teaching about sin is double-edged. It warns against the temptations which accompany an order that is maintained by arbitrary power, as well as against the dangers of anarchy. No order in the long run is tolerable, and in fact no order can endure, unless there is justice in it, and unless it proves to be compatible with a considerable measure of freedom. It may at times be necessary to break up an existing order, even at the risk of anarchy, to make possible a better order. But those who do this have a great responsibility to establish that better order, and in the process of doing so there may be moments when order itself has again the primary claim. But, if those who at those moments impose order try to preserve their power without taking account of other essential values, their order will in turn have to be challenged at the risk of anarchy.

A society is indeed fortunate that does not have to face ultimate crises of this sort. Christians who live amidst such crises have no book of rules by which they can determine what they should do from moment to moment, but they should be clear at all times how defective the stress on order as the one primary value is, and they should do what they can in their circumstances to make possible a type of order that is favourable to the elements of democracy which have been stressed above. Even if they can do little, they should help their churches to preserve for their children the vision of such an order.

III

Whatever we may say about the affinity or lack of affinity between Christianity and any type of political structure, we must not suggest that Christians cannot live as Christians under the most unfavourable form of State, even under a tyranny which persecutes the Church. In fact, it seems to be true that some degree of unfavourable political circumstances may put the Church on its

mettle and stimulate deeper, more faithful, and more courageous Christian living than is characteristic of Christians under friendly democratic governments.

We must not draw the conclusion that if suffering at the hands of a hostile and tyrannical State sometimes leads to the discovery of new dimensions of the Gospel, the more the Church suffers at the hands of the State the better off it will be. On the contrary, a situation may easily arise in which the Church will be cut off from its own youth and in which it will be extremely difficult for the majority of the young people in a nation to receive Christian education at all beyond the earliest family influences. The Christian family itself may be no real oasis in a hostile environment, because the totalitarian State is able so largely to counteract the influence of the family. Mature Christians may find loopholes for Christian witness even in the most forbidding circumstances, and they may rise to the level of Christian martyrdom, but this should not make the Christian indifferent to political principles and to political structures.

Not only must he consider the effect of a political tyranny upon young people and upon Christians who are less mature than himself; he must also consider the effect of such a political structure on the population as a whole, on the dignity of men and women generally, on their opportunity to develop their full human capacities. Christian love and compassion cannot be content with the possibility of a high level of saintliness for a few inside the Church, if the general effect of a political régime is to oppress grievously the majority of the people and to deny their essential humanity.

IV

A fourth difficulty is that any particular democracy can become deeply corrupted. All of its processes of reaching decisions may be used for ends which are incompatible with Christianity. Barth himself recognizes this when he says that "no democracy as such is protected from failing on many or all the points we have enumerated, and degenerating not only into anarchy but also into tyranny and thereby becoming a bad State."[7] This may be the fate of a State with an ideal democratic constitution, if there are not the spiritual resources available to make such a constitution work. I think that we should distinguish here between the failure of a democracy to work or for the democratic structure itself to be destroyed, and, on the other hand, the use of the processes of democracy with formal correctness to reach decisions which are patently evil. It would be possible, for example, for the American democracy to choose deliberately a callously isolationist policy. Or

[7]Barth, K., *op. cit.*, p. 44.

even without making such a deliberate decision, our democracy could become so wedded to a hedonistic and heedlessly self-indulgent culture that there would be a tendency for all democratic decisions to be corrupted by it.

To say these things is to admit that there are no secure institutions. Democratic institutions, as long as they are used and are not limited to paper constitutions, do make possible continuous correction of any forms of injustice or corruption. They provide for public criticism, and for the organization of political movements which are dedicated to reform. They preserve freedom for churches to keep before the people God's purpose for the nation.

Democratic institutions are not self-sufficient. They depend upon attitudes which no society can take for granted. They depend upon respect for and patience with people who differ. They depend upon real bonds of fellowship across the lines which divide people. They depend upon the existence among the people of a very widespread caring for justice. There must be a willingness to accept changes that may be against one's own interests. There must be loyalty to the community and a sense of personal responsibility to participate in political life. There will be a great deal of pushing and pulling between various interests in any democracy, but unless the people involved are capable of seeing to some extent beyond their own interests, democratic institutions will be destroyed.

Christians, in their support of democracy, should concern themselves with the nourishing of these attitudes, first in themselves and then in the community at large. They need not claim that they alone can do this. Indeed, they must admit that the Christian faith itself can take perverse forms, which need criticism from those who remain outside the Church, in part, because of what they have seen of these forms of Christianity. Yet it will not be easy to find resources for democratic life which are not directly or indirectly dependent upon the influence of Christ. We can avoid a false anxiety if we realize that God, who is known to us in Christ, is the Creator of all men and nations, and that we cannot chart His dealings with them where there is no conscious relationship to Christ.

Modern democracies are vulnerable to two kinds of sickness. One of them is the selfish irresponsibility of individuals and limited groups. The other is the kind of idolatry which makes the nation absolute or which sacrifices persons and concrete human goods to some one-sided programme of social redemption. Sometimes in seeking a cure for the first sickness a society will fall victim to the second. The one sure antidote for both at the same time is faith in God who is the Lord of the individual conscience, whose will includes the good of the community, and under whose judgment all such idolatries wither away.

THE FUTURE LIFE IN THE THOUGHT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT[1]

By H. H. Rowley, D.D., D.Litt., D.Theol., F.B.A.

'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you.' 'If the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised: and if Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain.' 'If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable'. 'I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes. . . . These are they which come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God; and they serve him day and night in his temple'. These and other words from the New Testament are familiar and precious to Christian people, nourishing a living faith in an after-life that shall transcend all the experiences of this life.

It is a commonplace that in the Old Testament we find a bleaker outlook on what lies beyond the grave, save in a few passages, and even in these there is little firm grasp of any satisfying doctrine of a worth-while after-life. Only at the end of the spiritual pilgrimage recorded in the Old Testament do we find the doctrine of the resurrection arising, and though during the inter-testamental period we find this doctrine gaining ground and in the New Testament period see it accepted as a Pharisaic belief, its rejection by the Sadducees shows that it was not then an integral element of the faith of Judaism.

A recent writer has claimed that he can establish that 'nothing less than resurrection was in the mind of Abraham and of all the faithful after him'.[2] This is effected by means of a rabbinic exegesis of the Old Testament, such as is found in the New Testament, indeed, but such as is without force today. He argues that the promise of the land to Abraham and his seed implies that he should be raised to share in the heritage. Such an approach to the text of the Old Testament, as though it were a legal document drawn up with precision by a lawyer, whose every word could be pressed to its maximum conceivable meaning, is not possible

[1]The Drew lecture delivered at New College, London, on November 2nd, 1954, and printed here by permission of the Trustees.

[2]Cf. N. A. Logan, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vi, 1953, p. 169.

except on the basis of a belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible —while the incompatibility of the teaching implied in different passages of the Bible makes such a belief quite impossible.[3] For, as we shall see, there is considerable variety and even inconsistency of view in the Old Testament on what follows death, so that to make God directly responsible for every statement is to charge Him with a very hazy knowledge about this subject.

Let me make it clear, as I have often done elsewhere, that I regard the Old Testament as the vehicle of Divine revelation, and not the mere record of man's upward reach to God. But the revelation came through the medium of imperfect personality, and both God and man are to be found here. Man's response to the Divine illumination was not always such as to lead to perfect apprehension, and even an inspired writer could have his thought coloured by ideas and beliefs which he had inherited from the past, or which reflected current ideas, and which he had not seriously examined or challenged. Both spiritual pilgrimage and Divine revelation are to be found here, often mingled together in a single complex, and a sympathetic understanding is harder than a naïve attribution of the whole to God or an equally naïve attribution of the whole to man.

In human speculation on the mystery of life and on survival after death, there have been three main lines of belief in the possibility of such survival. The one, represented especially in Indian thought, has worked with the idea of reincarnation, and Buddhism has offered to men the hope of breaking the weary round of birth and rebirth in the endless peace of Nirvana. This line of thought is not represented in the Bible. A second approach has led to the belief in the immortality of the soul. This is sometimes declared to be a Greek approach in contrast to the third, and Hebraic approach, which led to a belief in the resurrection.[4] In fact, there is in the Old Testament both a trend towards a belief in immortality and also the growth of a belief in the resurrection, and in the New Testament we find not only passages which look to the resurrection but also the thought of an immediate entry after death to the presence of God. Paul could say to the Philippians that he had a desire to depart and be with Christ, but it was more expedient for them that he should continue to live. Here there is no thought of waiting

[3]Logan further says 'To interpret God's pledge of the promised land to Abraham and his seed as being anything else than a pledge of ultimate and everlasting possession to each and all of them is to rob it of all substance and make sheer nonsense of the patriarchal faith' (p. 170). This would seem to imply that he expects that Abraham and all his descendants will one day be raised to enjoy life in a somewhat crowded Palestine. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews preferred to spiritualize the promise: 'But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly' (Heb. xi, 16).

[4]Cf. M. Burrows, *An Outline of Biblical Theology*, 1946, p. 193; and N. H. Snaith, *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, 1944, p. 89 n, where it is said that the immortality of the soul is not a Biblical idea at all.

till the day of Judgment, but of an immediate translation into the presence of Christ, who is elsewhere said to be seated at the right hand of God.[5] The roots of such a thought are not to be sought in Greek philosophy but in the Old Testament, and they go back farther than the thought of resurrection.

Oesterley observes that 'the belief in immortality, or as least in life of some kind hereafter, seems to be ingrained in human consciousness; it is doubtful whether any race of men, even the most backward, are without some ideas of an after-life, which is taken for granted.'[6] The quality of the life beyond the grave is what really matters, however, and amongst many peoples it has been thought of in terms of an existence less rich and full than the life on earth. In the opening words of the *Iliad,* Homer says that the fury of Achilles sent the souls of many valiant warriors to Hades, while they themselves were made the prey of dogs and birds. Here, it is to be observed, Homer does not say their bodies were made prey, but they themselves. The real man was the body, and what survived death was a mere shade.[7] Such a belief is not far from what we find in many passages in the Old Testament. Nor is this surprising. For behind the Hebrews stands the culture of Babylon, whence the Old Testament states that their fathers came, and Babylonian ideas are as gloomy as Homer's. Jastrow, writing of Babylonian religion, says: 'The nether world is joyless. . . . The place is synonymous with inactivity and decay; . . . . mortals are doomed to everlasting sojourn, or rather imprisonment, in the realm presided over by Allata and her consort Nergal.'[8] Our theme here, however, is concerned with the Old Testament rather than with its background, though it is important to remember that the lower levels of its thought are frequently shared with neighbouring peoples.

It is characteristic of the thought of the Bible from its earliest pages that death does not terminate man's existence. In the story of the Garden of Eden Adam is turned out of the garden lest he should achieve immortality, but here it is immortality in his physical form that is in mind. His body is destined to return in death to dust, yet he does not wholly cease to exist. That which

[5]G. Steindorff (*The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians,* 1905, p. 116) notes that in a single Egyptian text 'it is not rare to find the most opposite notions in the closest proximity to each other', and adds that this ought not to surprise us, since a modern clergyman will often combine a variety of incompatible ideas in a single funeral sermon.

[6]Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *Hebrew Religion,* 2nd ed., 1937, p. 17. Cf. H. Birkeland, *Studia Theologica,* iii, 1950-51, p. 63: 'The belief in a continuance of life after death is not absent from the religion of any people'.

[7]Cf. M. P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion,* E. Tr. by F. J. Fielden, 1925, p. 138: 'The souls are shades possessing neither strength nor consciousness, and such figures there is no need to propitiate and worship. A continued existence of this kind is of no value to man. . . . The life after death becomes so pale and empty that it is not far from non-existent.'

[8]Cf. M. Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria,* 1895, p. 565.

animates his body and differentiates him from the animals is thought of as continuing to exist without the body—though it is probable that it was believed to have a body which was in some sense a replica of that which it had left. To that, however, we shall return. Here it suffices to note that in man's make-up an immortal element was found. The unity of body and spirit was transient, but with its dissolution he did not cease to be. His body goes to the grave and to decay, but he is conceived of as still existing and as capable of some sort of conscious experience.

Every form of necromancy is forbidden in the Law and condemned elsewhere in the Old Testament.[9] Yet there is ample evidence that it was practised. The practice of necromancy implies a belief that the dead are still living. Moreover, the story of the witch of Endor shows that even a writer who approved of the condemnation of necromancy believed in its possibility. Its condemnation did not therefore imply a rejection of the belief that the dead were still living. In that familiar story it is to be observed that when the witch described the form she had called up, Saul recognized it to be Samuel. Here, then, we have reflected the belief that the form after death retained the likeness of that before death. It is not to be supposed that Samuel's physical body was believed to be capable of being raised from the grave by the witch, but more probable that he was thought of as having in the other world a body that was the replica of his physical body, though of thinner substance. Such a belief is not necessarily associated with necromancy, and we find it in later literature, without any such association. In the so-called *Apocalypse of Moses*[10] we read of the burial of Adam in the paradise on earth, and afterwards we read: 'God spake to the archangel Michael: Go away to Paradise in the third heaven, and strew linen clothes and cover the body of Adam'.[11] This seems to imply that the body which is buried in the earth has its counterpart in the heavenly Paradise.

The dead are commonly located in Sheol, and though this is often rendered by 'the grave' in the Authorized Version, it is clear that something other than the grave is meant, since the dead are sometimes represented as being together.[12] In the great taunt song in *Isaiah, xiv* the king of Babylon is depicted as mockingly greeted by his fellow-shades, who rise to greet him with the scornful

[9] Cf. Lev. xix, 26, Deut. xviii, 10, 1 Sam. xv, 23, xxviii, 3, 2 Kings xvii, 17, xxi, 6.

[10] This is the Greek form of *The Life of Adam and Eve*.

[11] Apoc. Mos. xl, 1 (translation of L. S. A. Wells, in R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ii, 1913, p. 151).

[12] With Sheol may be compared the Babylonian Arallu, which Jastrow (op. cit., p. 557) describes as 'the great cave underneath the earth in which the dead were supposed to dwell'. C. F. Burney (*Israel's Hope of Immortality*, 1909, p. 13) stresses that the Sheol conception 'was entirely unconnected with the religion of Yahwe'. On the relation between the grave and Sheol cf. J. Pedersen, *Israel I-II*, E. Tr. 1926, pp. 460 ff.

reminder that he had become as weak as they, and that he, who had once shaken the earth, had become the gazing-stock of all in the realm of the dead. If this picture stood alone, it would be unwise to press it, or to find in it more than a poetic expression of the fact that death levels all to insignificance. In view of many other passages, however, it may with greater probability be taken to testify to a belief that the dead were conscious, though impotent, and that there was some continuity of existence, though not a very worthwhile existence.

There are passages in which Sheol is represented as the destination of all, and as a place from which none can return. 'Their inward thought'[13] cries the Psalmist 'is that their houses shall continue for ever, And their dwelling places to all generations. . . . They are appointed as a flock for Sheol'. Or David says 'I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.' Similarly Job says 'He that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more'. Again Job pictures Sheol as a place where complete ignorance of all that is going on on earth prevails. 'His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; And they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.' Or again, in *Ecclesiastes* we read 'The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward'. In the story of the witch of Endor, however, Samuel is credited with knowledge even of the future after his death. Further, in the other passage already referred to, the shades are represented as familiar with the king of Babylon's record on earth, apparently after their own death.

Frequently we find the thought that in Sheol men are completely isolated from God. 'What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise thee? shall it declare thy truth?'[14] So cries one Psalmist. And another cries 'Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall they that are deceased arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? Or thy faithfulness in Destruction?[15] Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? And thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?' Yet another declares 'The dead praise not the Lord, Neither any that go down into silence.' Against this, however, we sometimes have the thought that God is even there. 'If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in Sheol, behold thou art there.' Here, however, the essential thought is that it is impossible to get beyond the power of God. Neither in life nor in

[13]The Septuagint and Syriac versions read a metathesized form of the Hebrew consonants, yielding the meaning 'Their graves are their homes for ever', and this is followed by many editors, and incorporated in the Revised Standard Version.

[14]Psa. xxx, 9 (Heb. 10). The R.S.V. here has 'my faithfulness' for 'thy truth', but offers no indication of any authority for the change of pronoun.

[15]Heb. Abaddon, a term used in the later and more developed thought for that part of Sheol to which the wicked go.

death can a man escape from His reach. There is nothing rich and comforting, therefore, in this passage, nothing that breathes of any fellowship with God after death, but only the note of warning.

As compared with the torment he was enduring in his flesh, Job could think of Sheol as an abode of peace. 'For now should I have lain down and been quiet. . . There the wicked cease from raging,[16] and there the weary are at rest. There the prisoners are at ease together; They hear not the voice of the taskmaster.' Elsewhere, however, Job thinks of it as a place of unrestricted gloom and discomfort. 'A land of darkness and of the shadow of death; A land of thick darkness, as darkness itself; A land of the shadow of death, without any order, And where the very light is as darkness.' The piling up of words meaning darkness is here to be noted, giving the impression of indescribable misery. And again, speaking of Sheol, he says 'But his flesh upon him hath pain, And his soul within him mourneth.' Here, it is to be noted, we have the thought that in the decay of the body in the grave the shade is involved in suffering, and there is another trace of the idea that the body which is buried in the earth has a counterpart which is spatially divorced from it, yet linked with its experience.

In all of this there is the seed of the thought of survival after death, though it offers no inviting prospect to men. It takes for granted that there is an undying element in man's make-up, though it holds out no prospect of any worth-while experience. Yet within the Old Testament we find developing a doctrine more satisfying than this. Moreover, that development takes a twofold form. What is of importance is that both lines of development were along distinctively Israelite lines. The one led to the thought of a richer survival after death in another world, and the other to the thought of a resurrection to life on earth. The former was quite independent of any Greek thought of the immortality of the soul, and the latter was not derived from foreign thought or practice.

Not infrequently attention is directed to the Egyptian cult of Osiris, as a source from which the idea of resurrection could have come into Israel.[17] It is highly improbable that when the thought of resurrection arose in Israel it owed anything to this source.[18] The cult of Osiris was related to the Canaanite fertility ritual and

[16]This is the reading of the R.V. margin. The text has 'troubling'. Driver and Gray (*The Book of Job*, p. 37) observe that the Hebrew is a substantive, which cannot have the transitive sense of troubling.

[17]The Osiris cult was originally a royal rite whereby the Pharaoh was assured of immortality after death through his identification with Osiris. Later it was democratized, and the privileges were offered to others. Cf. J. A. Wilson, *The Burden of Egypt*, 1951, pp. 116 f.

[18]Cf. P. Heinisch, *Theology of the Old Testament*, E. Tr. by W. Heidt, 1950, p. 267.

the Babylonian Tammuz cult.[19] The prophetic reaction against that cult was so strong that in any circles influenced by the prophets there would be reluctance to borrow anything that sprang from the central ideas and practices of the cult. That some of the feasts and ritual practices found a permanent place in Israelite religion is likely enough. But these were things that could be related to the faith of Israel and made its vehicle. There were other things which the prophets felt to be fundamentally opposed to Israel's faith, and which could only be rejected without compromise.

In recent years much attention has been paid to the rites of the New Year festival in the ancient Near East, and to the part played in them by the king.[20] In those rites the king ritually died and rose again in ceremonies in which he represented the god. It lies beyond the range of my subject to review the keen discussion which this question has roused, or to consider how far these rites were adopted and adapted in the religion of Israel. That some of the Israelite kings followed Canaanite religious practices is clear enough from the Old Testament, where they stand condemned. The Israelites were therefore familiar with them, as they would have been in any case, since they belonged to the world in which Israel was set. In *Isaiah xvii,* 10 there is a reference to the Adonis gardens, associated with this cult,[21] and in the book of *Ezekiel* we find a reference to weeping for Tammuz[22] Again in *Zech. xii,* 11 there is an allusion to the same cult in the mention of mourning for Hadad-rimmon.[23] Here then, it is sometimes thought, the idea of resurrection was kept before men, and from this ritual it can have come into Israel, perhaps at an earlier date than we are inclined to suppose.

[19]On the obscure relations between the Osiris cult and the cults of Adonis and Tammuz, cf. H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods,* 1945, pp. 286 ff. That there were local variations is to be expected, and Frankfort stresses these. Yet there were also important links between them. Lucian associates Adonis with Osiris (cf. *De dea Syra* 7, in C. Clemen, *Lukians Schrift über die Syrische Göttin,* 1938, pp. 8 f.). Cf. also T. H. Gaster, *Thespis,* 1950, pp. 50 f. On the fertility character of the Osiris cult cf. Frankfort, op. cit., pp. 185 ff. For a translation of the text *The Descent of Ishtar,* the consort of Tammuz, by E. A. Speiser, cf. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (ed. by J. B. Pritchard), 1950, pp. 106 ff.

[20]Cf. I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East,* 1943, and earlier *Myth and Ritual* (ed. by S. H. Hooke), 1933, and *The Labyrinth* (ed. by S. H. Hooke), 1935. A considerable discussion has arisen on this subject in which members of the so-called 'Uppsala school' have especially figured. H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods,* represents a different point of view.

[21]So this passage is understood by most commentators. Cf. G. W. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah,* 1911, p. 119; G. B. Gray, *The Book of Isaiah,* i, 1912, pp. 302 f.; L. Dennefeld, *Les Grands Prophètes,* 1947, p. 77. On the other hand E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah,* i, 1941, p. 200, rejects this view.

[22]Ezk. viii, 13 f. W. F. Albright (*Archaeology and the Religion of Israel,* 3rd ed., 1953, p. 167) says the cult of Tammuz 'can scarcely have become popular in southern Palestine before the seventh century B.C.', but adds 'There were many Canaanite gods of fertility which were related to Tammuz in character.'

[23]On this cf. J. W. Jack, *The Ras Shamra Tablets,* 1935, p. 19. On the subject of ritual weeping cf. F. F. Hvidberg, *Graad og Latter i det Gamle Testamente,* 1938.

This Canaanite ritual was not designed to set before men the idea of human resurrection. It was a fertility ritual, concerned with the annual renewal of nature.[24] The ritual death and resurrection of the king was not designed to set before men their ultimate destiny, but to bring about by the due performance of the rites the renewal of the springs of fertility throughout the community and all its possessions, both animal and vegetable.[25] Wild licence attended the festival, and the essentially fertility character of the religion was reflected in the sacred prostitution that went on in the shrines. It was this that made it so hateful to the prophets, and this that makes it unlikely that the roots of the belief in the resurrection grew out of this. It is probable, indeed, that the ritual of the fertility cult provided the Old Testament writers with many expressions for their use. There are many likely references to it, indeed. But these writers used the terminology and figures of that cult to express ideas which they brought, and which did not derive from that cult. So, when thought on the after-life developed in Israel, it was essentially different from that associated with the Canaanite ritual.

In the book of *Hosea* there is a familiar passage: 'Come and let us return unto the Lord: for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him.' The comment of a recent Roman Catholic writer on this verse is 'The expression is perhaps borrowed from the cult of Hadad, the god who rose three days after his death.'[26] If the language was borrowed from that cult, the thought of the writer had nothing to do with Hadad or with human survival after death.[27] He was thinking of the revival of the nation.

Similarly Ezekiel, in the familiar vision of the dry bones that were resuscitated when the breath of God came upon them, was thinking of the revival of the nation after the exile, and not of the resurrection of dead men. The whole vision was a parable of the life of the nation, dying in the exile but destined to be restored again. It may well be that the form of this vision helped to give currency to the idea of personal resurrection, but we have to wait till a much later time before any influence it exercised led to a formulated belief in a resurrection.

It is possible that Job in a daring moment cherished the thought

[24]Cf. H. Birkeland, *Studia Theologica*, iii, p. 67: 'The belief in a resurrection of Nature and God has very little to do with the resurrection of man'.

[25]Cf. Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 51: 'When the King performed the ritual act of connubium (the so-called "sacred marriage"), a purely "economic" measure designed to galvanize the vitality of the topocosm, this was translated in the accompanying myth into the nuptials of a god and goddess.'

[26]Cf. E. Osty, *Amos, Osée* (Jerusalem Bible), 1952, p. 94.

[27]Cf. H. Birkeland, *Studia Theologica*, iii, p. 74: 'The whole context shows that a *real resurrection* is out of the question'.

of a momentary resurrection for his vindication, though the passage is very obscure and many interpreters deny this view. In the Revised Version the passage reads 'But I know that my redeemer liveth, And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth: And after my skin hath been thus destroyed, Yet from my flesh shall I see God: Whom I shall see for myself, And mine eyes shall behold, and not another.' It cannot be denied that the crucial words are very ambiguous, and whatever our view of them we cannot claim that the words *must* have the meaning which we want to put on them. With still less justification can we emend the text to make it say more clearly what we want it to say. Some writers emend the text to take out all possibility of any reference to resurrection,[28] while others emend it to make the thought of resurrection clearer.[29] Either course seems to me to be unjustified. One of the most conservative of recent writers on the subject, Father E. J. Sutcliffe, denies that there is any hint of an after-life in this passage, and sets against it the already-quoted passages found elsewhere in the book of Job.[30] Here I think it is possible that while the author reflected the belief of his time in the other passages, he was feeling for something which went beyond it, but would not commit himself irrevocably to it, and hence used ambiguous words. I would neither overpress them to make him declare a clear doctrine of resurrection, nor would I brush them aside to make him no more than a reflecter of current ideas on this subject. He seems to me to have come to the verge of something to which he was impelled by the dynamic of his own faith in God, but not to have securely reached it. But in any case, we have here no more than the faith that he would be vindicated by the God in whom he trusted despite his perplexed outcry against Him, and that he would somehow be conscious of his vindication,[31] but no suggestion that more than a momentary experience was in his mind.

In two passages only in the Old Testament do we find anything more specific than this, and in one of these there is still disagreement

[28]So C. J. Ball, *The Book of Job*, 1922, pp. 276 ff.

[29]E. Dhorme, in his masterly commentary (*Le Livre de Job*, 1926, pp. 256 ff.), makes one emendation, which has the effect of making explicit a reference to Job's resurrection. Larcher, in the Jerusalem Bible (*Le Livre de Job*, 1950, p. 96), comments that this pushes the smoothing of the text too far.

[30]Cf. *The Old Testament and the Future Life*, 1946, pp. 131 ff. N. H. Snaith (*The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, 1944, p. 90 n.) says: 'The famous passage in Job xix, 25-7 can be made to refer to life after death only by a most liberal latitude in translation, a strong attachment to the Latin version, and reminiscences of Handel's Messiah. The Hebrew text is difficult, but it is unlikely that the vindicator is God, and Job almost certainly means that he will be vindicated before he is dead.'

[31]S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray (*The Book of Job*, 1921, pp. 171 ff.) are cautious in emendation here, and are content to recognize that verse 26 is corrupt without attempting to restore it. They find in the passage the thought that Job will be conscious after death of the change in God's attitude to him, but observe that 'there is still no belief here in a *continued* life of blessedness after death in which compensation in kind will be made for the inequalities of this life.'

as to the meaning. The first of these is found in the Isaiah Apocalypse, as chapters xxiv-xxvii of that book are often called.[32] Here we read: 'Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead.' By many this is understood to speak of the resurrection of the righteous to life on earth,[33] and the late date to which this section of the book of Isaiah is assigned is thought to harmonize with that view.[34] Some would ascribe the passage to an earlier date, and there are scholars who dispute that there is any thought of an individual resurrection at all. Father Sutcliffe, to whom I have already referred, believes that the reference is similar to that in Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, and that what the prophet has in mind is the national resurrection.[35] All probability seems to me to be on the side of this view, and the whole tenor of the context supports it. If the thought is of individual resurrection, it is still only the resurrection of the righteous. But it seems to me more likely that the author is thinking of the overthrow of all hostile powers which have brought the Jews into misery and suffering and the exaltation of his people. Against this it may be argued that in the previous chapter he says 'He hath swallowed up death for ever'; but this may mean that never again will His people be reduced to that low condition which the author, no less than Ezekiel, could think of as the death of the nation.[36]

The other passage is the only clear and universally recognized reference to resurrection in the Old Testament. This is the passage in the book of *Daniel* which declares that 'many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' Here it is sometimes thought that Persian influence may be traced.[37] That there was

[32]W. Rudolph (*Jesaja 24-27*, 1933, p. 59), while recognizing apocalyptic motifs in these chapters, observes that they can only be called an apocalypse with reserve.

[33]So G. B. Gray, *The Book of Isaiah*, i, 1912, p. 446; G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1916, p. 118; W. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 485; J. Lindblom, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse*, 1935, p. 48; L. Dennefeld, *Les Grands Prophètes*, p. 103; E. S. Mulder, *Die Teologie van die Jesaja-Apokalipse*, 1954, p. 106. I. G. Matthews (*The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel*, 1947, p. 229) says this verse 'glories in the confidence of the physical resurrection and the individual immortality of Israelites'.

[34]R. H. Pfeiffer (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1941, pp. 441 f) assigns this section to the third century B.C., and I have accepted the view that it is not earlier than the time of Alexander (*The Growth of the Old Testament*, 1950, p. 93). Some have placed it later than this, in the second century B.C., but in view of the finding of the Dead Sea scroll of Isaiah at Qumran, it is improbable that this date will survive. For that MS. contains these chapters and is probably of the second century B.C. and almost certainly not later than the first century B.C. J. Lindblom (*Die Jesaja-Apokalypse*, 1938, p. 84) would assign Isa. xxiv-xxvii to *circa* 485 B.C.

[35]Op. cit., pp. 128 ff. So also G. W. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, pp. 170 f., A. van der Flier, *Jesaja*, i, 1923, pp. 137 f., and E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, i, p. 298.

[36]Sutcliffe (op. cit., pp. 125 ff.) here differently understands the verse, while denying that its thought was of individual resurrection.

[37]Cf. H. Birkeland, *Studia Theologica*, iii, pp. 75 f.

some influence on Jewish thought from Zoroastrianism may be agreed,[38] but it is improbable that it is to be found here.[39] It is to be observed that here is no thought of a general resurrection, such as we find in Zoroastrianism, but only of the resurrection of some of the righteous and some of the wicked. It is a very selective resurrection, and also it is a resurrection to life on earth. It is probable that the writer was thinking of the martyrs of the Maccabaean age and the leaders of the opposing section of the Jews who furthered the hellenization of the land and sided with the alien king. The writer believed that world empires of the kind that had successively arisen were about to come to an end, and that the enduring kingdom of God was about to supersede them. The dominion was to be given to the saints of the Most High, and a kingdom that should never pass away was to be established. In the stories with which the author had encouraged his fellows we read of men who were cast into a burning fiery furnace and who were delivered, and of one who was cast into a den of lions and who came forth unharmed. The author believed with all his heart that God could deliver men from torment and death. Yet he knew that many who shared his loyalty to the faith of his fathers and his devotion to the cause of the truth had died in the persecution and the struggle. I think it is probable that he was carried by the dynamic of his own faith to his belief in the resurrection. If God had not delivered them, it was not because He could not, but because He designed some greater vindication; and if He was about to set up the everlasting kingdom of righteousness, He would surely not exclude from a place in it those who had given their lives in loyalty to Him. It was these martyrs who would surely be raised to share the joys of the kingdom. On the other hand, there were enemies of the saints, traitors who had helped the power that exalted itself against God, who had found an easy death in the course of the conflict. For these the author looked for a resurrection that they might reap the just reward of their treachery in a shame that should befit their infamy.

It is probable that this verse is not the reflection of a developed

[38]Cf. what I have written in *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed., 1947, p. 40, where I have recognized in particular Persian influence on the development of angelology.

[39]On Persian influence cf. E. Stave, *Uber den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judentum*, 1898; E. Böklen, *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie*, 1902; L. H. Mills, *Avesta Eschatology compared with the Books of Daniel and Revelation*, 1908; J. Scheftelowitz, *Die Altpersischen Religion und das Judentum*, 1920; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii, 4th ed., 1925, pp. 189 ff.; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period*, 1941, pp. 85 ff. W. F. Albright (*From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2nd ed., pp. 275 f.) says the value of Iranian religious influences for our understanding of Judaism and early Christianity has been greatly exaggerated, and later (p. 280) observes that Iranian conceptions exerted no effect on Judaism except where the ground was fully prepared for them.

doctrine of resurrection which was held in the author's day, but rather a corollary which he drew from his general beliefs about the kingdom which he thought was on the point of being established, and his conception of the justice and power of God. But while he drew the corollary only in relation to the bitter struggle of the hour, his words played a vital part in the development of the thought of the resurrection which marked the period from the Maccabaean age to the New Testament period. The religious side of the early support of the Maccabees came from the group that developed into the Pharisees and into some of the more pietistic sects that grew up amongst the Jews. In the apocalyptic books that were composed between the Maccabaean age and the end of the first Christian century, we find this thought of the resurrection taken up and presented in a variety of differing ways, and we know that in New Testament times the Pharisees cherished this belief. On the other hand the Sadducees rejected the doctrine of the resurrection. To them it was of recent growth and without authority, and it must be agreed that apart from the one passage in the book of Daniel, it is not very securely established in the teaching of the Old Testament. It should also be remembered that even in the passage in Daniel there is nothing like the Christian view of an after-life in another world. What is in mind is resurrection to physical life in this world alongside those who had not passed through death.

There are some passages in the Old Testament which refer to God's power to kill and to make alive, at which we must look, since they are sometimes thought to imply a doctrine of resurrection. In the Song of Hannah we read: 'The Lord killeth, and maketh alive: He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up.' Here the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon* says that the meaning of the first line is that He restores the dead to life,[40] and Kennedy follows this and says it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the second line declares the poet's belief in a resurrection from the dead.[41] In that case, however, he would ascribe the poem to a date well on in the post-exilic period, because of its links then with *Isaiah xxvi*, 19 and the passage in *Daniel* at which we have looked. I am not persuaded that the Song of Hannah need be anything like so late as this, and in the Song of Moses, which few would ascribe to so late a date,[42] we find a similar expression: 'I kill and I make alive'.

In the Song of Hannah it is by no means certain that the meaning is that the Lord restores the dead to life and brings up from

[40]Cf. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, ed. by Brown, Driver and Briggs, 1952 ed., p. 311 b.

[41]Cf. A. R. S. Kennedy, *Samuel* (Century Bible), p. 44.

[42]G. A. Smith (*The Book of Deuteronomy*, 1918, p. 343) inclines to think that Deut. xxxii is a pre-exilic poem which received additions from an exilic scribe; H. Wheeler Robinson (*Deuteronomy and Joshua* (Century Bible), p. 219, places it in the latter part of the Exile; while R. H. Pfeiffer (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1941, p. 280) ascribes it to the first half of the fifth century.

Sheol those who have passed through its portal. The following verse says that He maketh poor and maketh rich, He bringeth low and lifteth up. Here it is most natural to understand the meaning to be that God makes one man rich and another poor, one humble and another exalted. So in verse 6, it may well be the same, and the meaning be, not that God kills a man and then brings the same man to life, but that the issues of life and death are in His hands, so that He brings one to death and another to birth. By parallelism this is repeated in the second half in different words, which say that He brings one down to Sheol and another up into life. When we are dealing with poetry we should beware of prosaic literalism, and the pressing of words in a wooden way. Job cries 'Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither.' It is only the prosaic editor who is bothered by the word 'thither'. Here is even less reason to press the words 'he bringeth up' to mean 'he bringeth up from Sheol', since there is not even a 'thence' added.

If, however, it be desired to press verse 6 to treat of the same person throughout each half, in contrast to verse 7, which speaks of two different persons in each half, there is still no reason to find here any thought of resurrection from the dead. As Kirkpatrick observes 'Death and Sheol are figuratively used for the depths of adversity and peril; life for deliverance and prosperity.'[43] Or in the words of A. R. Johnson 'Just as death in the strict sense of the term is for the Israelite the weakest form of life, so any weakness in life is a form of death.'[44] 'Thou hast delivered my soul from Sheol' cries the Psalmist, when he wishes to rejoice in deliverance from mortal peril. On this view, which is taken by many commentators, the meaning in the Song of Hannah is that God brings a man into dire straits and then rescues him. This meaning would excellently fit the passage in the Song of Moses, which goes on after saying 'I kill, and I make alive' to say 'I have wounded, and I heal.' On either of these views there is no reason to find any doctrine of resurrection in these passages, and such a doctrine is most improbable in either of them.

We may now turn to the other line of development, which led to the thought of a more worth-while existence than the dreary doctrine of Sheol offered beyond the grave. The essential thing to note here is that it developed from the idea of God, and not from the idea of man. Plato in the Phaedo makes Socrates say: 'After I drink the poison I shall no longer be with you, but shall go away

[43]Cf. A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The First Book of Samuel*, 1903 ed., p. 54.

[44]Cf. *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, 1949, p. 94. Cf. also p. 107; 'In short, the normal Israelite view . . . . is that to be in sickness of body or weakness of circumstance is to experience the disintegrating power of death.'

to the joys of the blessed you know of.'[45] Here the thought of immortality is based on the conception of man, and on the belief that the body is the least essential part of man. Amongst the Hebrews the starting point was not the natural immortality of the soul but faith in God.

We find the development in some passages in the Psalms, and particularly in two passages. In Psa. xlix we read: 'They are appointed as a flock for Sheol; Death shall be their shepherd. . . But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol: For he shall receive me.' The general thought of the psalm is of the emptiness of the prosperity of the wicked. There is no need for the righteous to envy him, because whatever he has in this life, he can carry nothing with him beyond the grave. The gloom of Sheol is all he can look forward to. In contrast to this all that is said of the righteous is that God will redeem his soul from the power of Sheol, for He will receive him. Here the meaning cannot be as in the passages already looked at, where Sheol is the figure for distress and tribulation. In the first place, in the preceding verse Sheol, in relation to the wicked, is clearly the abode of shades beyond the grave, so that the same meaning is required here to give the contrast. In the second place, if the meaning were simply that the righteous would be delivered from his distress, he would still be worse off than the unrighteous, who is promised no distress in this life in the psalm. What the psalmist is clearly saying is that the injustices of this life will be rectified beyond the grave, where the wicked will go to the miseries of Sheol, while the righteous will be taken by God unto Himself. Father Sutcliffe thinks the author of this psalm half discerned the truth of a richer afterlife.[46] I would go somewhat further, since I find it hard to escape the conclusion that he thought of something far higher than the barren Sheol view, at which we have earlier looked, and held that the fellowship of God might still be the vital experience of those who in this life had truly known it.[47]

The other passage is more problematical and both translation and interpretation are disputed. It is found in Psa. lxxiii. In that psalm the author first speaks of the envy with which he saw the prosperity of the wicked, while he himself was in distress. The thought that virtue is vain arises in his mind, only to be rejected. It is followed by the comforting thought that the wicked find their

[45]Cf. *Plato* (Loeb edition) i, E. Tr. by H. N. Fowler, 1917, p. 395.

[46]Op. cit., p. 102.

[47]C. A. Briggs (*The Book of Psalms*, i, 1907, p. 411) says this verse 'implies the assumption of the righteous dead by God to Himself', but holds that it is a late gloss. Cf. also R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, 2nd ed., 1913, pp. 74 ff. C. F. Burney (*Israel's Hope of Immortality*, p. 41) says: 'The more I examine this Psalm the more does the conviction force itself upon me that the writer has in view something more than the mere temporary recompense of the righteous during this earthly life'.

prosperity changed to disaster with the suddenness of an awakening from a dream. Then he perceives how hollow is this satisfaction, and how foolish he is not to penetrate more deeply into the nature of his problem and its true solution. He now realizes that the lot of the righteous is superior to the lot of the wicked, even in the moment when the wicked enjoys his prosperity and the righteous suffers his adversity. For while the wicked has his prosperity, the righteous has God. 'Nevertheless I am continually with thee: Thou hast holden my right hand. Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, And afterward receive me to glory.' The crucial last line is ambiguous,[48] and Father Sutcliffe is persuaded that the psalmist was thinking only of this life. He says 'The conclusion . . . is that the Psalmist is manifesting his confidence that God would, in this life, vindicate His justice on the wicked, and by some bestowal of honour on His servant show that virtue is what He desires and accepts.'[49] It seems to me more probable that he means that both through the years of mortality and beyond death his treasure will be in God's fellowship. The God who enriches him with His fellowship in this life will not abandon him to Sheol at death, but will take him to a fuller fellowship hereafter.[50]

It is to be observed that in both of these passages from the Psalms God is said to 'receive' or 'take' the righteous. In the brief story of Enoch it is said that he walked with God and then was not, 'for God took him', where the same word is used.[51] Enoch is represented as one whose fellowship with God in this life was notable, and who was taken into further fellowship without passing

[48]H. Gunkel emended the last line vigorously, to yield the sense 'And in the way thou strengthenest my liver' (*Die Psalmen,* 1926, p. 319); H. Graetz, followed by many scholars, emended to yield 'And thou takest me by the hand after thee' (*Kritischer Kommentar zu den Psalmen,* ii, 1883, p. 440); G. Beer by emendation imported the meaning 'And thou instructest me in the way of glory (*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* xxi, 1901, pp. 77 f.); while H. Herkenne excises the word rendered 'thou wilt receive me' and then emends verse 24 to yield 'With thy counsel thou leadest me in the way, Thou glory and strength of my heart (*Das Buch der Psalmen,* 1936, p. 250). These emendations are all without authority, and there is no reason to prefer any of them to the Massoretic text.

[49]Op. cit., p. 107.

[50]N. H. Snaith (*The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament,* p. 89 n.) says 'the argument is valid only in the English Version. The Hebrew reads "the heavens". He is speaking geographically. Further, *Kabod* (glory) means honour and prosperity in the things of this life; it means heavenly bliss only with the English Evangelicals of a former generation. The "after" means after these temporary distresses'. In contrast to this, Oesterley (*Hebrew Religion,* 2nd ed., p. 364) says: 'As to the belief concerning the future life, the passage witnesses to the conviction that it is a glorious life, for in the Hereafter God is man's portion for ever'. It is interesting, too, to note that the Jesuit Father, C. Lattey, adopted the rendering and the interpretation which Snaith would confine to the English Evangelicals of a former generation (*The Psalter in the Westminster Version,* 1945, pp. 136 f.). Lattey finds 'a distinct, if rather vague, reference to the next life.' C. A. Briggs (op cit., ii, 1909, p. 147) comments that 'the psalmist finds the solution of the inconsistencies of this life in the final reward of the righteous after death.'

[51]Cf. O. Schilling, *Der Jenseitsgedanke im Alten Testament,* 1951, pp. 26 f. The word is, of course, a common one which is used in other connexions. It is used, for instance in Psa. xviii, 16 (Heb. 17), where the thought is limited to this life.

through death. While that story comes to us through the Priestly writer, it was scarcely created by him, but probably rested on an ancient tradition. It bears testimony to the thought of fellowship with God persisting beyond the life of this world, and independently of any thought of resurrection to life on earth. The high privilege of fellowship with God in this life, and its importance for man's well-being, figures elsewhere in the Old Testament, and the great word in the book of *Micah* expresses God's demand in terms of righteous living, the manifestation of the spirit of *hesedh*—which implies both initiative and response in gracious behaviour—and the humble walk with God. To the prophet that walk with God was the necessary basis of the life to which he called men; but to the psalmists it was a privilege and a joy. They seem to have believed that men who pass through death may have that fellowship continued beyond the grave no less than Enoch. Sheol was not the last word the Old Testament had to speak concerning the life beyond death. For God is the final Lord of all, and He is able to take to Himself those who are His.

On these two psalms, W. E. Barnes observes 'It should be observed further that in both Psalms it is an individual hope; the two Psalmists confess the hope as a personal testimony to a prospect which doubtless they wish "the Righteous" to share with them. But for them the Future Life is a hope, not a doctrine, a hope struggling to express itself in a *milieu* in which almost all men felt that Death was the end of all for the individual life.'[52]

There is one final passage at which we must look, and this is also of disputed significance. In Psalm xvi we read 'Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol; Neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.' The final word is of disputed meaning, and the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon* allows only the meaning 'the pit' for it. Father Sutcliffe defends the meaning 'corruption',[53] and I would agree with him that it could be derived from a root which means 'be corrupt'. That root is used of corrupt or immoral behaviour, and more widely of marring or spoiling things. It is not used of the corruption of the body in decomposition, though this noun is once used in *Job* parallel to the worm of corruption. I am doubtful if the meaning 'Thou wilt not allow me to experience decomposition' would be expressed by saying 'Thou wilt not allow me to look on destruction', and I therefore prefer the meaning given by the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*. This well fits the context, since 'the pit' is a good parallel to 'Sheol', in harmony with the principles of Hebrew parallelism.

The general thought of this psalm is very close to that of the

[52] *The Psalms*, ii, 1931, p. 348.
[53] Op. cit., pp. 76 ff. So also J. Calès, *Le Livre des Psaumes*, i, 1936, p. 199.

other two at which we have looked.[54] The psalmist begins by saying that he has no good beyond God, who is his portion and his strength. Just as in Psalm lxxiii he thinks first of his fellowship with God as his supreme blessing in this life. And then he continues 'Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol'. There is no indication in the psalm that he is suffering any deep trouble, so that it is not deliverance from death that is in his thought. It is rather deliverance in death and beyond. He will not be abandoned to Sheol.[55] The peace and confidence which is his for this life will be his beyond, since the God who is his strength will still be his. 'Thou wilt show me the path of life; In thy presence is fullness of joy; In thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.'

While, then, the Old Testament does not offer any uniform and sure doctrine of the after-life, it offers some glimpses of a faith which satisfies.[56] Its conception in these glimpses is of life with God, and not merely a bliss conceived in terms of human life. It thinks of life, and not merely of the dreary survival in Sheol, and that life derives from God and His fellowship. It is the portion of those who in this life find the spring of their being in the divine fellowship, and it is because the enduring God is the spring of their life that that life shall endure. Little as this may appear to be, it is more than philosophical speculation can offer, since the basis of its hope is not in human thought but in God. He who created man for His fellowship, and in whose fellowship is man's truest life and well-being here, is the source of his eternal hope. He offers man life because He offers Himself, and that life shall abide, because the abiding God is its source.

[54]M. Buttenwieser (*The Psalms,* 1938, p. 511) holds that Psa. xvi is dependent on Psa. lxxiii.

[55]Briggs (op. cit., i, p. 121 f.) holds that the meaning is that God will not abandon him in Sheol, but will go with him and remain with him there, and will save him from seeing the dungeon of Sheol, where only the wicked go.

[56]Kirkpatrick (*The Book of Psalms,* 1906, *in locis*) finds no thought of an after-life in any of the three passages from the Psalms examined above, and O. J. Baab (*The Theology of the Old Testament,* 1949, p. 218) similarly understands these passages. G. R. Berry (*The Book of Psalms,* 1934, *in locis*) understands the passages in Pss. xlix and lxxiii of the after-life, but not that in Psa. xvi. That scholars are so divided in their understanding sufficiently indicates that no clear doctrine is here enunciated, and it is unwise to press the interpretation on either side. That is why I speak of a glimpse, rather than of a firm faith. Cf. G. Quell, *Die Auffassung des Todes in Israel,* 1925, p. 40.

THE HEARING EAR

By Hans Stemple, D.D.[1]

The Lord God hath given me the tongue of them that are taught, that I should know how to sustain with words him that is weary. He wakeneth morning by morning, He wakeneth mine ear to hear as they that are taught. The Lord God hath opened mine ear and I was not rebellious neither turned away backward.—Isaiah, L, 4-5.

Dear Brethren in Christ!

After a considerable interval the Synod of the Evangelical Church of Germany has once more been able to assemble. It is now, for the second time, holding its deliberations in Berlin, four years after its last meeting in Weissensee. And this, its opening session in this church, calls to mind the community of weak and suffering folk, broken or on the point of breaking, along with their pastors and administrative officers. And thereby two things are brought to our minds. First, the mandate (which applies equally to a Synod) to care for and feed the whole flock of God—which at once suggests to us the amount of wisdom and patience, devotion and self-sacrifice such a task requires. In the second place such a meeting brings out quite clearly that, however lofty be the mandate of the Synod, its various members are in God's sight only weak and imperfect human beings, people of whom one of our Whitsuntide hymns speaks:

> Earthen vessels only are we made,
> Frail every moment, if Thou dost not aid,

and who find it necessary to cry out: 'Thou only, Lord, makest us to dwell in safety'. By this two-fold recognition the Synod not only calls up the thought of our weak and distressed congregations —it knows that in God's sight it is one with them and of them.

We have grown accustomed to take it for granted that worship means, in Luther's words, that God speaks to us and that we make answer to Him in prayer and praise. Hence we rejoice to feel that our requests and supplications always find their way to His ear. But, is there not such a thing as finding God's ear closed to us? I do not mean that God casts us off entirely, but it can happen that some of our petitions do not reach Him. The Scriptures know well that there are such occasions, and at times speak of them in the most solemn terms. We are met here a few weeks after the Berlin

[1]A sermon preached at the Opening of the Synod of the Evangelical Church of Germany in Berlin, on Sunday, 14th March, 1954. Translated by Sydney H. Moore, M.A.

Conference. We prayed for it and, in close connection therewith, for the re-uniting of Germany, one of the most fervid desires we cherish for our fatherland. Now that that Conference is over, everything that matters seems to be exactly as it was before. That is a grievous burden for us all, whatever our political views may be. We have called on God to remove this dividing-asunder of our country. Is His heart closed to us because our people have so long been divided in their attitude towards Him, some putting their trust in Him, while so very many more despise Him and have no time for faith in Him, as we hear so many say?

When such thoughts beset us, Calvin has a word of exhortation for us. In a letter to the church at Aix-en-Provence he writes: "Not without reason does the Scripture lay such weight on keeping us in the right path, despite all our over-haste; it is so hard for us to leave to God the honour of acting as He wills and not as may seem good to us." That word 'over-haste' hits us all, for we think something under ten years a long time, especially when they have been filled with such experiences as this last decade. But it is with God we have to do, who has allowed His people Israel for thousands of years to live scattered and suffering among alien races. Calvin writes in the same letter: "This is a time when we are compelled on the one hand to act and on the other to suffer." How that applies to so many of our brothers and sisters whose longing eyes turn to Western Germany, where 'action' seems so much more effective and exuberant but 'suffering', by and large, so much more neglected than with them; where people can breathe more freely and not under such a constant heavy burden of care.

In such days it is a comfort when our text, the theme for this second week of the Passion, sets before our eyes the word of God's 'suffering Servant.' So there *is* an opened ear then! Morning by morning it is awakened. And because it is opened toward God, it is opened toward men. There is a voice which is able to speak at the right time to the weary, because God has instructed and taught it so to do. The child of God takes on himself the guise of God's 'Servant'. With him that voice tarries, handing on to the heavy-laden and the disillusioned His comfort and encouragement. But his mouth, too, is ever prepared, and his words announce God's demands upon the proud and the mighty, words (as was said of those of His 'Servant') able at once to be an arrow in the quiver and an avenging sword or, as Jeremiah puts it, a 'hammer that breaks the rocks in pieces.'

Now it is here we come upon our first question: Are we able to hear that voice at all? Do the proud and mighty still hear it? Does it still penetrate as far as to the heavy-laden and the sorely

stricken? I know people often say how noticeably both the will to hear and the capacity to hear have declined among us. That is true indeed as regards the part of our life concerned only with this world. We shudder at the thought of those men in a political era now over and done with, who shouted out their ghastly monologues, and who scarcely took any interest in whether those to whom they spoke had anything to reply or to object, who were indeed almost indifferent whether they were listened to at all. We find plenty of men around us to whom the radio serves all day as background noise to all their divers occupations. They are often hardly able to give any account of what has flooded into their ears. Is it to them merely a din, and no longer an articulated, sane and logical expression? Experiments have been made as to how long people can attentively follow the spoken word. The results have been mortifying: it may be sermons come off even worse than other types of speaking! How vastly more important, however, is it for the relations of men of our time with the supernatural, the eternal world, that their capacity for hearing has grown small! Are we not all so obsessed by that which flows into our minds from the earthly sphere, that scarcely a faculty remains available to listen for messages from the eternal world? How painful it is for us in our prayer-life to free ourselves from all that is of the earth—which oppresses or seduces us—and how often, even at their best, are our prayers rather a storming in upon God than a listening to Him! 'For seeing ye shall see and in no wise perceive, and hearing ye shall hear and shall in no wise understand.' Is this stern word of Jesus the condemnation of our generation? And yet all this is not the final, the decisive, obstacle to men of our day apprehending God's demands and consolations, and to us who are Christians that we do not apprehend Him as we should. Fundamentally it is guilt, standing between God and man, which makes our ears dead or dull of hearing towards Him. However the capacity for hearing or not hearing may have changed today, man, in view of his guilt, has remained the same since the time when he was thrust out from the gates of Paradise.

But now our text tells us that God can awaken, can unstop ears that were sealed against His voice. That is at once humbling and uplifting. The servant of God needs just that, and the prophet, unknown to us by name, who sang the songs of God's 'Servant' and had looked upon His glorious face and was constrained to tell of it, led a life of suffering among his people. His ear was opened towards God right in the midst of the political conflict then being waged between East and West. He who desires to comfort folk, weary of being tossed from illusion to hope and from hope again to illusion, finds his own inward ear open to God's comfort. And he,

whose ear has been opened so that he may himself turn wholly to God, becomes, in temptation, obedient. As he has first turned to God, he now turns to the world. 'The Lord hath opened mine ear; I was not rebellious neither turned away backward. I gave my back to the smiters.' By turning to God he has taken suffering as his own burden.

Similarly Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son, acknowledges of Himself in all humility: 'As My Father hath taught Me, even so I speak.' 'All that I have heard from My Father I have made known unto you.' 'The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do.' The more in the quiet of the night and in the early morning hours He grows ready for God, the more He becomes aware of the need of mankind. In the turmoil of the crowd He yet hears the cry of the blind beggar by the wayside. He dies the most agonizing death. The hour of death brings to the Crucified the grim question whether God's ear may not now be entirely closed against Him and He be left forlorn, alone. And yet, even then, His ear does not fail to catch the confession and request of the dying malefactor at His side. That must happen to the servant of God, if his ear is to be opened. The Son can bring no message, no comfort, save what has first been spoken to Him. How much more do we need our ear to be opened, opened once and for all, in order that we may be awakened each morning anew! Faith means being a child, a pupil. Faith means not living on what one has, but being pointed to that commanding and forgiving Word, which gives light in darkness, saving comfort in despair. Faith means not going with unbowed head, at any time we like, to hammer on the door of the eternal world and hearken to its exquisite music. Faith means humbly waiting till the door is opened.

But for whom does God's servant receive consolation? And for whom does the Son receive the message? For whom is He Himself the living Word? How could one who is weary and heavy-laden not open his ear to that kindly Voice, which alone can set him on his feet again? How can the wretched and the captive not be given his hearing that he may become free and unfettered? And that is what is happening, too, in our own day. Amid the tension of East and West, God is opening men's ears and choosing them for His servants. He allows the man downtrodden in the rush of the world to find in His Word peace, and puts on his lips a new song of praise. God can open men's hearts, men whom He has been silently guiding through long years of intense loneliness. He is not bound by man's capacity or inability to hear or not to hear. He is not limited by the greatness of human guilt or the bitter agonies which tear a man's soul as with torture. His cry, 'Awake!', is

addressed to Jerusalem, to the Church that has drunk to the dregs His cup of wrath. Men free and men bound have testified that God has accomplished this for them. They have learnt to thank Him for it and for a path that leads through unspeakable suffering and whose end they could not and cannot foresee. And what deep treasures of His Word can God not open up to them who were far off from Him, so far off that one would think them completely beyond all hearing distance!

But our theme is focused even yet more sharply. 'He awakens my ear', it tells us, 'so that I hear like one that is taught, like a disciple,' and so the question that faces us is this: Can we still hear as disciples hear? We must not rob this old word Isaiah uses, 'disciple', of the ring it has gained for us in the New Testament.

Have we here today still this directness of hearing? Do we possess it, we members of a people upon whom such calamity and such guilt lie? Is the will to discipleship still alive in us? To hear as a disciple! Let us try to get light quite simply from the testimony of one of the greatest of the Apostolic band. We shall not find it in the ecstatic things we see and hear, of which Paul speaks in II Cor., xii. We shall not find it in the mystical absorption into another world, a 'third heaven', however amazing and profound be the knowledge gained thereby. That he might not be exalted beyond measure by such revelations, Paul was given the 'thorn in the flesh, Satan's messenger, to buffet him.' He prays to be set free from this dreadful pain, and learns that God's ear is closed to his request. But he does not stop praying. And his own ear is opened. He now hears as a disciple, and he hears what a disciple does hear: 'Let My grace be sufficient for thee, for My strength is made perfect in weakness.' The fact that even a man of the world, no practising Christian but a man with an open mind for the power and range of the human spirit, might acknowledge that the manner in which pain and inward help, pain and grace are interwoven here makes this one of the most inspired thoughts ever given to man in his pilgrimage through this world to the next. On the other hand, an enemy of the faith might in contempt or anger call it the most elaborate deception ever practised. But he whose ear is opened could of old, as today, perceive, as a disciple of God, complete comfort, God's reality, in the word spoken to him, which he clearly hears. The thorn remains in the flesh and all that that connotes: misfortune, sickness, pain, incomprehensible temptation. But being a disciple means, 'Look at the grace!' And that suffices.

How marvellously does Calvin explain this to the prisoners in Lyons: "Indeed, it cannot be otherwise than that you should find

here or there some weak point. But put your trust in this, that He whose servants you are will in such wise through His Spirit maintain the upper hand that His grace will overcome every temptation. Has He not already promised He will strengthen in patience all those who suffer chastisement because of their sins? How much more then will He refuse to abandon in distress those who are fighting His fight and whom He needs for so splendid a purpose as to be witnesses of His truth? So keep ever in mind His word: 'He that dwelleth in you is stronger than the world.' "

May I further add this? Can we not link up this fight for faith within us with the fortunes of our people? The thorn in the flesh of the Germans behind the Iron Curtain still remains. We have held special meetings for prayer about it, but what we longed for has not happened. In the West the question of the Saar is now eagerly discussed. When in 1935 the re-union of the Saar with Germany was being considered, meetings for prayer were also held. The Saar came back to us then: was that a hearing of our prayers? Was that a gracious gift from the generous hand of God? Did we as a people then receive it as a gift? Was it not rather at once set down as a gain we ourselves had scored? Was not this first great success of Hitler's foreign policy perhaps the first deep draught from the cup of wrath offered to our people? Such a question may cause offence; should it not rather provoke reflection among us, in view of what is now happening or not happening? Ought it not much more to help us to bow trustfully before the will of God? Considering the severe testing we have gone through, it will be worth our while to follow the inward light. Alongside the thorn in the flesh stands grace, immense and mighty—not grace determined by race, but rather the pure free grace of God in Jesus Christ which, despite even the divided body of the Church and its imperfect service, is effective in Word and Sacrament as the *seeking* grace of God finds its way into our people and the peoples of the world. And if I have once more reminded you of the historical development of our nation, it is in order to express what is the concern of us all. However keenly our wishes remain centred on national re-union, however earnestly we shall have to struggle to bring it about, our warmest desire for our people must still be: 'If thou hadst known, even thou at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace.' We must pray that, in spite of the difficulty of its lot and even whilst the thorn quivers hurtfully in the flesh, a new ear may be granted to our people for the word of grace, a new longing for grace—grace, an all-supporting power, amid all the weakness of actual daily existence. To listen like a disciple! Whatever we can or cannot then do, God will open our

heart to this word, 'Let My grace be sufficient for thee,' and at this admission, 'He that dwelleth in you is stronger than the world.' That is a clear ray of sunlight, piercing the thickest gloom.

With Paul there is Peter to teach us what it means to listen like a disciple. In that early Easter hour on the lake, someone says to Peter, 'It is the Lord standing on the shore.' And without hesitation Peter girds himself in his fisher's coat, throws himself into the water, approaches the Master and listens, as only a disciple can listen who has plunged so deeply in guilt as he. The Lord asks him: 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these'? and again, and yet again, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?' To listen like a disciple means that in all the racket and hurry and rush we feed on this word in our heart. Our prayers must be that every day our ear may be awakened afresh to this question of all questions, 'Lovest thou Me?' God grant we may be able to confess with Peter, 'Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee' and that we may then anew receive the commission, 'Feed My lambs! Feed My sheep'!

Where such hearing exists, such confession made from the heart, such a commission accepted, the world is moved: in the days of God's 'Suffering Servant', in the days when the disciples followed the Lord and went up to Jerusalem, in the hour of the Reformation. "The Holy Scriptures will in all cases where a Christian needs knowledge be found clear and luminous enough to light up all darkness"—that was what the men of the Speyer Protestation 425 years ago accepted and confessed. To listen like a disciple! Where this is done the Church is moved, the congregation becomes alive. But there will be pain and a cross. 'I was not rebellious, neither turned away backward. I gave my back to the smiters . . . I hid not my face from shame and spitting.'

May our Lord grant to us in this Synod that morning by morning our ear may be awakened, that we may hear as disciples, as they that are taught. May He teach His Church how to speak, at the right time, to them that are weary. May He weld us into one by the question addressed to each of us separately, 'Lovest thou Me?'; by the confession He expects from us, 'Thou knowest that I love Thee'; and by the commission—the same for each of us, and the great theme of this Synod—'Feed My sheep! Feed My lambs!' May God turn us to Himself, and in so doing, to the world. May He help us to true obedience that we may not turn away backward. And may He grant, however the thorn in our flesh may smart and the fist of Satan buffet, we may do as our fathers did, and confess and praise His glorious and mighty grace.

Are not all the creeds exactly that—the proclamation and the praise of His grace?

In whom has that grace been perfectly manifested? Through whom does that grace rescue us and set us free? It has been the custom throughout the whole of Christendom to name each year as it rushes past, the year of our Lord. It has been the custom, and still is, to date each year, as did, in their piety, those who went before us, *anno Domini*. Now, however, throughout a world-wide Christian Church, another name has been given to this year 1954, and at its outset a prayer has been made in which we cannot join. Rather, moved by the Gospel, must we confess:—

There is One alone, who has conquered sin and death and who can change the thoughts of our hearts. There is One alone, at whose name every knee shall bow and through whom men know of a truth that they are brethren. There is one throne alone in the ages without end to which songs of praise arise, the throne of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. There is One alone who shall be crowned through eternal years—'The Lamb that was slain is worthy to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honour and glory and blessing'. Amen.

THOUGHTS ON MINISTERIAL TRAINING

By John Huxtable, M.A.[1]

I begin with three preliminary considerations; and the first deals with perspective.

We shall not get our thinking about ministerial training into anything like true perspective, unless we begin by realizing that training cannot of itself provide the ministry our churches need. The ministry is a divine gift to the Church, a bestowal of the ascended Lord, who imparts to His Church whatever it requires for the building up of itself in love, until all its several members, knit together in the mysterious fellowship of the Spirit, attain to their true manhood and come to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. He calls those whom He has fore-ordained to the ministry, men to whom He has committed His Word, who are to follow Him in the ways of love until His very life is made manifest in their mortal bodies. They are to share our Lord's ministry; in some sense, they are sent as He was sent: in that sense, he who receives them receives Him. So far does Christ commit Himself to our hands; to such an extent His Word, His saving activity, is entrusted to men who can only dimly understand His eternal purpose; to such earthen vessels He commits so much of His treasure.

All this demands what no training can provide, such a personal communion with Jesus Christ as can give a man that confident assurance which proclaims the eternal Gospel as 'my Gospel,' which reveals that he knows God otherwise than by hearsay, which gives him an existential basis upon which to build stone by stone a theology which shall at one and the same time be truly Biblical and utterly personal. More than that, only out of such encounter with the living Lord can a man develop the true character of a minister, that supernatural compassion with human need, that vivid perception of what is a soul's real problem, that endless patience with human weakness and disloyalty, that humility which can bear to be instructed by the ignorant; indeed, the love that never fails. Such is the ministry which the churches need; and only Christ can provide it.

This is not to belittle what theological training can and should provide for those who are called to the ministry, but rather to set

[1]This article is based upon an address given to the London Congregational Union in October, 1954.

ministerial training in its proper context, and by so doing to disclose the limitations within which it must take place. It is ancillary to the kingly rule of Christ in His Church. It is, so to say, a battle school in which a *corps d'élite* learns to see something more of the Commander's strategy, and to use the weapons which He has provided for the struggle to gain the world's soul. He chooses the men; He provides the weapons; He controls the battle. Ministerial training takes place within the vast purposes of God's redeeming grace.

To recognize this helps us to get our perspectives clearer: certainly, it helps us to avoid asking the wrong questions, and may help us to ask the right ones. For instance, it is sometimes said that the colleges are not producing the sort of ministers that the Churches want. Whatever weight there is in the charge would be immensely increased if we could be sure that what was really in mind was this question: Are we getting the sort of ministers Christ wants the churches to have? Again, enthusiasts of one sort and another often demand that such and such a subject should be added to the curriculum a theological student must pursue. Such advice is often given because it is hoped that some 'cause' will thereby be furthered. But the prior question must be not the strengthening of a whim or the propagation of an enthusiasm, but what sort of curriculum is required to enable the men Christ has called to be His ministers to do the work He has called them to do.

My second preliminary consideration concerns a plain fact, which is that the men whom Christ calls to be His ministers do not always fall into the neat categories which would make it easy to deal with them administratively as well as academically. The variety of Christian experience becomes immediately and revealingly clear to anyone who at any stage has to deal with candidates for the ministry. Amos was called from minding the flock and gathering fruit, and was regarded as a somewhat unlikely prophet: he was himself astonished at his vocation. And he was a prototype of a good many who show every known token of a call to the ministry, but by the sheer fabric of their experience demand that they be treated by no rule of thumb. In a fallen world we cannot always treat each case on its merits; but at least we must have enough spiritual elasticity to be ready to adapt general rules to particular needs. Since Christ seems to call into the ministry a great variety of men, we must suppose that He does not desire a stereotyped ministry; which demands that, within certain well understood limits, ministerial training must not be stereotyped either.

We Congregationalists are not particularly rigid in our requirements for ministerial training: indeed, we are much more flexible than, for example, are the English Presbyterians. But we usually

seem somewhat ashamed to admit that not all our ministers are trained in precisely the same way; and perhaps this is due to a confusion of thought which, if it exists, should be cleared up. We are rightly aware that the ministry demands the best possible training. The old ideal of a learned ministry still stands, provided that we interpret the word 'learned' in a liberal fashion. Yet we are not to assume that any particular academic regimen will provide all candidates for the ministry with an adequate preparation for their life-work. This is not at all a plea for lowered standards: rather, it is a twofold plea that the standards should be the right ones and that we should be discerningly adaptable in the application of them.

The third preliminary consideration concerns the nature of theological education.

The whole task to which theological teachers are committed would be much easier if all that were required of them were to indoctrinate a given number of students with unquestioned dogmas over a given period, after which they would be commissioned to repeat these orthodox formulae wherever their writ happened to run; but that is precisely what Protestants in general and Congregationalists in particular could never accept as an ideal of ministerial training. While I trust that our loyal acceptance of the faith once for all delivered to the saints will not be called in any question, we should all hold that, before a man can preach it, he must not only know the Christian Faith as an objective fact; he must also appropriate it for himself as his own conviction; he must learn to speak of the eternal Gospel as 'my Gospel.' Ministerial training, therefore, must be as far as possible removed from indoctrination; it must be real education; and those who submit to its discipline must be trained to think for themselves. There is relatively little virtue in studying the history of Christian thought, for instance, unless all the time your own mind is being stretched and shaped, enriched and uplifted. The teacher's main task, therefore, is so to instruct his students that their own convictions are formulated and deepened. The greater their independence of mind the better he has done his work; and the more they hold pale reflections of his own opinions the greater his failure. The ministry will soon wear out 'reach-me-down' convictions and reveal them in all their threadbare shabbiness. Unless a man has wrestled with the truth as it is in Jesus until he has mastered it, or, rather, until it has mastered him, how can he be a true minister of the Gospel?

Having disclosed the angle from which I approach the whole matter of ministerial training, let us examine the traditional training given to Congregational ministers, which is essentially the same as that required by most Reformed Churches, at least in Europe.

The symbol of this training is the M.A., B.D. degrees. I have heard this type of training called 'the Fairbairn model', since it was Andrew Martin Fairbairn who did so much to establish it in England and Wales. No doubt it was a natural enough adaptation of the pattern of instruction given in the Dissenting Academies to the new situation in which Universities were no longer closed to non-Anglican citizens; no doubt, too, it was somewhat influenced by what had become established over several centuries in Scotland; yet, whatever its precise history the traditional or established pattern of theological instruction among us amounted to a grounding in Arts and Theology. Whether degrees in either or both subjects were actually taken does not at the moment affect the issue: what matters is that it was assumed to be essential that a prospective Congregational minister should undergo the discipline of a first degree, preferably an honours degree, in Arts,[2] and then proceed to a thorough grounding in Theology, during which he would study Biblical subjects (including both Greek and Hebrew), theology with kindred philosophical subjects, and the development of Christian life and thought, Church history. It cannot be said, of course, that such training in its fullness is required of all who train for the ministry of the Reformed Churches today, though in Scotland it is still almost universal; and in some of our own colleges it still holds sway, at Mansfield chiefly, but also in the full courses provided at Lancashire and Yorkshire Independent, at both of which, however, a less exacting provision is also made. Such is the foundation pattern from which we have either progressed or declined.

I have no wish to speak of this sort of ministerial training with other than praise and thanksgiving, for I owe to it more than I can ever measure; yet we ought not to assume that it was perfect or is unalterable; and perhaps what modifications of it we ought to make may begin to become clear, if we examine some of the assumptions upon which it rests.

First of all, it assumes that a minister shall be a man of culture, well-versed in secular as well as sacred learning. The ideal of a learned ministry was generously understood; and it seems to have been assumed that he would not be much of a theologian, if he knew nothing but theology.

In the second place, it seems to have been taken for granted that a candidate for the ministry would have time for six or seven years of exacting, full-time study, and that resources were available to maintain him during this longish period.

It was further assumed, in the third place, that such preliminary

[2]An Arts course was regarded as a proper and necessary preparation for Theology: is this essentially true? Can the same be said at all—if so, to what degree?—of Science?

education as a candidate for the ministry would have undergone would have been of a sufficiently classical flavour for the study of Greek and Hebrew to afford few obstacles. It is notorious, for example, that the Honours School of Theology at Oxford was in the first instance, at least, designed for those who had taken 'Greats', i.e., had been thoroughly grounded in the Classics. It is true, of course, that this has been modified in recent years; but there is still enough truth in Karl Barth's remark that 'Oxford is the place where they learn ancient languages and think that makes them theologians' to make it sting—at least a little!

There was a fourth assumption, that the minister would serve an established community, whose place in society (like his own) was not questioned. His business would be to build up the faithful, to feed the lambs of the flock, and to present the promises and claims of the Gospel. The 'heathen' were not self-conscious or organized; and the minister's problems would be either those of indifference or personal sins such as drunkenness. For such outsiders as there were, a professional evangelist could be engaged periodically; but since more of those on the fringe seem to have attended evening service in those days than is usual now, the preacher had certain evangelistic opportunities in the pulpit then which we on the whole do not enjoy today.

I end my list of the assumptions underlying our traditional pattern of theological education with this fifth observation. It was generally taken for granted that the candidate for the ministry would discover certain professional skills by a combination of two dire methods. He would learn to preach *solvitur ambulando,* just by doing it, which is like teaching a child to swim by throwing him in at the deep end of the swimming bath; or else he could be expected to learn this aspect of his trade by being told to read Phillips Brooks and by being made to endure the necessarily hit-and-miss discipline of sermon-class. I do not think lightly of what can be gained by all this; and I have never read a Yale or Warrack Lecture on Preaching from which I have not learned something of value. What disturbs me, however, is that I cannot find anywhere any indication that men were taught the technique of preaching, or that it was thought that such teaching could in fact be given.

Allied with this curious blind spot is another: a strange lack of any help for a theological student in the cultivation of the devotional life. It seems to have been taken for granted that the man would come into college well able to read his Bible and say his prayers, and that he would maintain and even deepen his hold on the spiritual life more or less by the light of nature. This reflects what is one of the most serious defects in our general Church-life: we constantly exhort our people to more prayer without adequately

showing them how to carry out the injunction. That, however, is not our immediate business; all I want to say at the moment is that, if Florence Allshorn was right in thinking that training in the devotional life was one of the most important parts of a missionary's training, much the same must be true of a minister's training. Our traditional pattern of theological education was lacking at this very point.

I have already started more hares than I can chase; but I have indicated what are some of the problems that face anyone who takes up the work of theological teaching today. I subscribe to the ideal of a learned ministry without hesitation or reserve. The 'Fairbairn model' is too valuable for anything less to take its place, at least as the ideal. But a variety of conditions makes this ideal increasingly difficult to attain. Our problem is how to maintain the ideal of the minister as a man of secular as well as sacred culture within the severe limitations which now beset us.

Before we can really answer that problem we must take yet another factor into consideration. The minister no longer serves an established community whose place in society (like his own) is secure, at least not in anything like the same way as was true forty years ago. The whole pattern of society is changing; and the Churches face pressures and oppositions which were formerly unknown. Moreover, as likely as not a minister will serve a small group of people whose presence in the locality seems to make no difference at all to its life. He will indeed build up what faithful there are and he will have opportunities for work among young people; but he will know himself called to be an evangelist with at least a different constraint from that which his Victorian predecessor felt. The Church is now a minority movement in a pagan or 'post-Christian' society, which is in the main either indifferent to or intolerant of its work; and modern man is so generally ignorant of the Christian Faith that evangelism essentially includes a process of education in which instruction in the Faith must go hand in hand with Christian comment on the basic structures on which contemporary life rests; and if evangelism does not include that process of education, we shall run the perilous risk of filling our Churches with people who think they have been converted while their fundamental attitude to life remains unaltered: that would not amount to the conversion of the world, but the world's invasion of the Church.

Add to that certain quite practical considerations. Save in a very few cases are we able to provide resources for a course of six or seven years' full-time study for our ministerial students? Shall we find enough men who are prepared to give that amount of their life to preparation for the ministry in addition to the two years

they must now give to National Service or some alternative to it? What are we to do about the increasing number of candidates whose educational background is so scientifically conditioned that not only is the linguistic aspect of theological studies a formidable obstacle to them, but the whole climate of thought in which our work is conducted strange? What are we to do with a large number of men whose vocation comes to them after they have done with school and National Service, and who look back upon their education regretting that they did not know earlier what line it would have been profitable to take? Put all these factors together, and you have to devise a reasonably adequate training for men of limited educational background and economic resources who, for quite understandable reasons, think that four years is as much of their life as ought now to be spent in preparation for the ministry.

With all that in mind let us look once again at the ideal of a learned ministry with its traditional assumption that the minister should be well-versed in secular culture as well as sacred learning. I rejoice that some still undergo this discipline; and in whatever adaptation of it we may have to accept as a second-best—it is that! —I want to make the same assumption; for it is deplorable that some theological students—and, perhaps, some ministers, too—profess to be interested only in 'religion': they will become the sort of ministers who only read what will help them to make sermons, men who never make any real impact upon secular society, because they have never really been in touch with it or made any honest and serious attempt to understand it. If for a single moment we tolerate, or still worse encourage, a ghetto-mentality, we shall rapidly cease to be effectively evangelistic. How can we preach effectively if we do not understand the world we live in? Is not one of the most striking elements in the last verse of *Romans viii* that St. Paul really had taken the measure of all that scared the life out of first-century man?

This means that, whether the theological student has a good understanding of secular culture or not, the theological teacher must do his work in such a way that the relatedness of his subject to the world in which the theological student will minister becomes apparent. Theological colleges cannot afford academic isolationism. Let me illustrate this point from two subjects, Historical Theology and Christian Ethics. In lectures on the Christian estimate of man, the material surely ought not to be presented out of relation to the teaching of Marx and Freud, whose combined influence has done an immense amount to undermine Christian anthropology. Or again, lecturing on Christian Ethics surely carries the obligation to relate Christian teaching about responsibility and freedom to the complicated issues of the Welfare State, and about the bearing of

the Gospel on the nature and claims of the State. I do not suggest that the theological teacher should depart for a moment from intellectual and academic integrity, that he should suppose that he is a propagandist rather than a teacher: but to teach theology as if the world about us were not what it is is not only to miss a golden opportunity of indicating to the student the relevance of what he learns to the work he is going to do, it is also to increase the already too widespread illusion that theology is of no consequence anyway.

I have already said that a good many candidates for the ministry will have to be trained theologically without that thorough grounding in secular culture which for so many reasons is highly desirable; and for such men the theological teacher will have to do what he can to make good the loss. But what is the basic theological training which all should receive with whatever adaptation individual cases may require?

First of all, of course, a thorough introduction to the Bible, its nature, the way in which it came into being, what it teaches, how it is to be understood and used. We can no longer insist on the study of Hebrew at all stages, though we can, and do, encourage it; but we must go on saying that Greek is essential. There is, as Wheeler Robinson used to say, something amiss when the spokesman of a religion cannot handle its sacred books in the original tongues.

About Biblical studies I wish to make two comments. The first is that I assume throughout what is commonly, but not very happily, called the critical approach to the sacred Scriptures; and I stress this particularly in view of the distressing recrudescence of fundamentalism. Apart altogether from all the illumination which we have derived from modern Biblical scholarship, it is no more than plain honesty to acknowledge that the Bible came into existence in a certain way, and that this inevitably conditions our attitude to it. Whatever be the final authority in the Christian religion, it is not such as can be derived from an infallible book.

The second comment on Biblical teaching is that theological training is defective at a crucial point if those who undergo its discipline are not instructed how to handle the Bible in preaching and exposition. It is a fact that the critical approach to the Bible has robbed some preachers of a confidence they ought to have in dealing with the Bible. This need not necessarily be so at all; but I draw from the fact of this lack of confidence the inference that theological students need more in their Biblical studies than instruction in the origins of the Bible and linguistic explanations of prophetic and Apostolic writings. They have never been given merely that, of course; but I wonder whether they have always been given sufficient insight into the unity of the Bible, into the

relatedness of its parts, and into the way in which the preacher should use the Biblical material in his proclamation of Christian truth.

I need only mention the importance of theology, with its kindred disciplines of philosophy of religion on the one hand, and Christian ethics on the other, and of Church history, with its always relevant instruction in what the Christian community has in fact done, the record of its successes and failures, the story of its understanding of its own life, and the interaction of one type of Church-life upon another. The plain necessity of all this for theological education is so obvious; but I add one comment: if the value of these studies is not to be lost upon those who undertake them, it is essential that they should be helped to see not merely what this theologian taught, nor merely what happened at such and such a period in Church history, but what was at stake. To illustrate this point from my own field of studies, I would say that merely to state what St. Thomas Aquinas taught about the theology of redemption or the behaviour required of Christians in this or that situation is to fail. What matters is that the students should watch one of the greatest of all theologians at work, observe his attempt to express Christian truth in terms of Aristotelianism, and see what happens as he does it. A theologian's method is often more instructive than his actual achievement, especially if what you most need to learn is how to make a theology of your own.

Let me now turn, by way of conclusion, to two points mentioned earlier, training in preaching and the cultivation of the devotional life.

It is true, of course, that preachers are born and not made. If a man has not the gift of preaching, which is a gift of the Spirit, no human agency can provide it; but gifts can be developed and cultivated. In every sermon that really succeeds there is a curious blending of inspiration and technique, the latter subservient to the former, of course, yet nevertheless essential, if the inspiration is not to evaporate and be wasted; and how many times have we failed to deliver a message which certainly came from God through sheer incompetence? Now this technique can be taught; and it is either laziness or false pride which makes us think lightly of the technical skills of our vocation. Through examination of the sermons of the masters and the speeches of the great orators the architecture of oratory can be made clear; and by the same method some of the mysteries of style can be forced to yield up their secrets. Certainly theological education fails at a point where failure counts most, if men emerge from it without the power to convey the Word of God in sermons that are well thought through and clearly expressed.

What I have said about the cultivation of the spiritual life arises more from a hope than from any clear perception of what can be done; and that hope was inspired in this way. Ever since I knew anything at all about the ministry—and for a child of the Manse that goes back to the very beginning—I have been aware of the fact that some men with good paper qualifications never make anything in the ministry, though many do, and that some men who seem to possess almost none of the technical qualifications exercise a spiritual influence long remembered with gratitude. That does not mean that theological education is of small consequence—of all fatal *non sequitur's* that is as fatal as any—but that what matters most of all in the ministry is a certain type of character. It will be found in all those who have exercised really profitable ministries; and the secret of it is simply that it is the product of a humble walk with God. Can theological education be complete without some indication of how that walk is to be maintained? I know that we can no more manufacture men of God than we can make preachers; but I should dread no verdict upon our work so much as that we turned out well-instructed young men who somehow could not maintain the spiritual glow.

NEWMAN'S *APOLOGIA PRO ROMA*

By E. L. Allen, Ph.D., D.D.

I

Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* in part accompanied and in part effected the transfer of his loyalty from the Church of England to the Church of Rome. Hence the condition of intense strain under which it was written, for the writer was in fact being borne along by the current of his argument. He was received into the Roman communion on 9th October, 1845, with the work still unfinished; he had reached the point at which a decision was required of him, and he took it. The final paragraph was added to make of the book, no longer the travel-diary of a pilgrim, but the confession of one who had reached the sanctuary and, at least for the time being, found peace there. When the finished volume was submitted to Cardinal Wiseman for his judgment, he was shrewd enough to see that it would render more effective service to Rome if it went out without those modifications that would be necessary to secure his *imprimatur*. He would commit himself to no more than recognizing the usefulness of a statement by an Anglican, who was no longer such, of the argument that had finally convinced him of the Roman claims.

Newman cites de Maistre and Möhler as predecessors in the investigation he undertakes. They of course had Roman dogma particularly in view. But we who look back on the year of its publication, 1845, can see that the book was only one more expression of a main tendency of the time. The philosophy of history had familiarized the European mind with the idea of development, and the time would soon be ripe for Darwin to recast it for biology with his theory of evolution. The Hegelian philosophy justified the present by showing how it had grown, stage by stage, out of the past; the Absolute comes to its own by a logical process that is mirrored in the historical development of the race, of philosophy, of religion, and so on. The German historian Niebuhr left his mark upon men like Thomas Arnold in this country. Newman might dread the infiltration of German methods and ideas, but they were part of the atmosphere he breathed. An earlier generation could not have wielded the weapons that were at his disposal. He was in fact deliberately opposing an alternative theory of historical development that had found favour among critics, according to which the process by which Christianity had passed from the New Testament to the Catholic Church was one of decline

and corruption. He set himself to show that it was not that, but the growth of a tree from its seed, natural, inevitable and therefore justified.

The reception accorded to the book was doubtful at first. True, a Catholic prelate lectured enthusiastically on it in Edinburgh and reported that the Protestants in his audience were favourably impressed. One would like to know just what ground he had for that assertion. What created trouble for Newman in particular was the use made of his book by American Unitarians, who seized upon it eagerly as admitting that the doctrine of the Trinity was unknown before the third century. The Modernist appeal to Newman's argument might have discredited both it and him when it was made at the beginning of the century, but by that time the authorities were able to distinguish between the thesis itself and the use to which others put it. Newman's position is today assured, so that the writer of the article on Revelation in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* can say: "The theory . . . . is in perfect conformity with orthodox belief. Newman . . . . teaches that the whole doctrine, alike in its earlier and its later forms, was contained in the original revelation given to the Church by Our Lord and His Apostles, and that its identity is guaranteed to us by the infallible magisterium of the Church".

The Modernist evocation of Newman was for two purposes. On the one hand, since Catholicism had developed so far by enlisting in its service what the environment offered, as an organism grows by what it feeds on, yet remains the same in so doing, why should it not similarly come to terms with the modern world? Could development be halted at the Vatican Council? On the other hand, Loisy and Tyrrell offered the Church a new apologetic. For was not the Jesus of consistent eschatology, with His dogmas and His superhuman claims, the natural starting-point for Catholicism? If modern scholarship thus vindicated the Church, how could the Church refuse alliance with it? But for Rome it was a case of *Timeo Graecos, et dona ferentes*. Yet if Newman's argument could not serve to bridge the gulf between Rome and the modern world, it was admirably adapted to smooth the passage of many an enquirer from Anglicanism to Rome. I content myself with referring to one of the most recent instances of this, as related in Bede Griffiths's autobiography *The Golden String*.

II

Before attempting a criticism of Newman's thesis, it may be of value to offer a brief summary of it. He requires for his argument not one major premiss but two, the principle of development and the principle of infallibility. What is given in Scripture

is in the form of image or idea, a whole that is grasped by faith but waits to be analyzed by thought. Its content can only be brought out by the labour of many minds through successive generations; it is like a mountain-peak that has to be seen from many points and in many types of weather if its grandeur is ever to be apprehended. Hence a vast historical process of enquiry and definition is needed to make explicit what was implicit in Scripture from the first. But, Newman continues, it is impossible to suppose that that from which the process set out had divine authority, while the development itself was at the mercy of men. No, there must be an authority that advances *pari passu* with it and decides the form the development is to take, marking off the work of the Spirit from any merely human product. Without such an authority, we are deafened by the disputes of rival claimants or surrender to scepticism.

One who accepted Rome as such an authority would not need to go farther at this point, but an enquirer such as Newman must. For he has to show that Rome has always been able to do what is so difficult, to distinguish the genuine development of an idea from its perversion. He therefore sets out seven tests that serve this purpose. He states them at the outset of the argument, when he is still concerned with development of ideas as such and not yet with that of Christian ideas. The tests are therefore such as ought to command general agreement, whether the use to which they are put subsequently does or does not do so. They are: (i) Preservation of Idea, so that it remains essentially the same in all the changes of form and presentation it undergoes; (ii) Continuity of Principle, so that a law can be traced through the development, keeping it self-consistent; (iii) Power of Assimilation, the ability to utilize what is offered from outside while remaining true to oneself, discriminating what is of service from what is not; (iv) Early Anticipation, so that there are indications already at an early stage of what will come out later; (v) Logical Sequence, so that, however spontaneous the development may be, each phase can be seen later to follow on the earlier phase; (vi) Preservative Additions, so that what emerges as new does but safeguard the old; (vii) Chronic Continuance, what has been achieved endures.

These tests have then to be applied to Christian doctrine as it has developed in history, in order to determine whether Catholicism as it exists today is, as Protestants aver, a corruption of the original Christian idea given to us in the New Testament or a legitimate development. I shall confine myself to two instances, to show how Newman proceeds.

The first is *Christology*. And here he makes the admission that was so welcome to the Unitarians. "No one who has looked ever

so little into the theological works of the ancient Church, but is aware that the language of the ante-Nicene Fathers on the subject of our Lord's divinity may be far more easily accommodated to the Arian hypothesis than the language of the post-Nicene." He then goes on to show how subsequent discussion, by withdrawing from reference to the Son passages that spoke of honours paid to a created being, whether the angel of the Lord or Wisdom, left those passages to justify the invocation of the saints and Mary. "The Church of Rome is not idolatrous, unless Arianism is orthodoxy."

The second is *Papal authority*. Here he has to meet the objection that the letters of Ignatius, though emphatic on the need for discipline and authority within the Church and on the exalted status of the episcopal office, breathe no word of Rome or the successor of Peter. His reply is that Peter's authority was not mentioned, simply because there was no need to do so. The appeal to the bishops was enough. Also, that authority was as yet embedded in the common life Christians lived and attention had not been specially directed to it. "St. Peter's prerogative would remain a mere letter, till the complication of ecclesiastical matters became the cause of ascertaining it." It is not therefore surprising that we have to wait till the fourth and fifth centuries to find the Papal claims clearly asserted and as clearly acknowledged. What was implicit from the first became explicit in time, when circumstances called for it.

III

I propose now to point out what seem to me four of the weakest points in Newman's able construction. (a) Has he not proved his case by first selecting the evidence that would serve his purpose? Thus, it is remarkable how slight and infrequent are the references to the New Testament. He does not in fact set out from the original "idea" of Christianity, but rather from the earlier stages of its development, in the Apostolic Fathers. Nor does he turn his attention to the medieval Church. We are not told how he regards the Hildebrandine Papacy. Was it a legitimate development of the commission to Peter? The period of history from which he derives his evidence terminates in the sixth century. So he excludes the apostolic period, with such awkward incidents as Paul's rebuke to Peter on a point of doctrine and James's occupation of the presidential chair at the Council of Jerusalem. But for what is wanted—to show how the Roman see came to supremacy in Western Europe—no better period could have been chosen.

(b) I have mentioned above the failure to do justice to the New Testament. Not, of course, that the appeal to Scripture is not made. It is, but in a manner that again prejudges the issue in his favour. For he insists that Scripture must be interpreted in the mystical

and not in the literal sense. This is "one of the characteristic conditions of principles on which the development of doctrine has proceeded", and he brands Theodore of Mopsuestia as a heresiarch for reading the Old Testament in its simple and natural sense. One of his (Theodore's) major offences was that he made use of Jewish commentaries. Now it is clear that the mystical interpretation of Scripture can justify the theory of development, because it is doubtful whether there is anything it could not justify. Thus, Newman gravely assures us that vows of celibacy are supported by Numbers and the veneration of the Virgin Mary by Genesis. He alarms us, however, when he goes on to assert that "this method of interpretation" is "the very basis of the proof of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity". If the duel between Catholic and Protestant is to be fought under the condition that the former is to choose the weapon, we know where the victory will fall.

(c) The maxim *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* had great weight with Newman, and he makes vigorous use of it in his account of the fourth century with its numerous schisms. He rightly points out that the rival churches that sprang up usually allowed themselves to be called by the name of their founder, while the main Christian communion was left to appropriate to itself the name Catholic. But how does the argument differ from an identification of truth with the majority opinion? He is impressed by the size of the Catholic Church, by its presence in every province of the Empire, and so on, and seems to imply, naively enough, that this success was due to the inherent truth of its dogmatic definitions. He says nothing whatever of the support given to it by the secular authority, or of the disgraceful methods to which ecclesiastical leaders sometimes resorted to suppress opposition. A Gibbon would have little difficulty in explaining the victory of the Catholic Church as due to bribery, intrigue and coercion. And if such an account would be unfair, the other view, which sees only the guidance of the Spirit in it all, would be equally exaggerated in the opposite direction. That in the period under examination the Catholic Church was the most imposing body is certainly the case; it does not follow that it had the truth on its side.

(d) I said earlier that Newman's argument requires two major premisses, the principle of development and the principle of infallibility. A scholarly enquiry such as the *Essay* can state and employ various tests in order to determine whether a given claim to be a development of the original idea is legitimate or not. In the conduct of life, one must have a more accessible criterion. The probability that "there is an authority capable of deciding whether this, that, and a third, and any number of theological statements are true" rests on its extreme desirability, since without it the work of God

in the original revelation would be lost amid the confusion of human opinions. Newman is apparently unaware that there is another claimant to infallibility, the Greek Orthodox Church, and that it has a quite different conception of what infallibility and authority are. For it, the Church as a whole is the bearer of authority, so that its members are at once under authority and called to exercise it; while the Papacy marks the betrayal of the Gospel to the Roman state. It is not, of course, surprising that Newman's interest was confined to the West; such a restriction of vision invalidates his argument for us.

IV

I pass now from points of detail to a consideration of the method Newman employs. The argument moves throughout from the present to the past. If in the earliest centuries of the faith a Church can be found that has the features of the Catholic Church as we know it today, then we may assume that the latter is continuous with the former. "On the whole, then, we have reason to say, if there be a form of Christianity at this day distinguished for its careful organization, and its consequent power; if it is spread over the world; if it is conspicuous for zealous maintenance of its own creed; if it is intolerant towards what it considers error; if it is engaged in ceaseless war with all other bodies called Christian; if it, and it alone, is called 'Catholic' by the world, nay, by those very bodies, and if it makes much of the title . . . . and if they, on the other hand, call it seducer, harlot, apostate, Antichrist, devil; if, however they differ one with another, they consider it the common enemy; if they strive to unite against it, and cannot . . . . if they fall one after another, and make way for new sects, and it remains the same; such a form of religion is not unlike the Christianity of the Nicene Era."

There are several such statements in the *Essay*, and the principle invoked is in each case the same, namely, that one should "interpret the previous steps of a development by the later", or that one should "view the beginning in the light of the result" and "let the whole elucidate the parts". This of course is diametrically opposed to the Protestant principle, for which the New Testament is in some sense normative and what is incompatible with it is to be rejected. In the first case, the standard is a law immanent in the process of development; in the second, it is given as the starting-point of the development. Perhaps each principle has its sphere of application. Thus, an earlier generation appealed to Magna Charta as the guarantee of the Englishman's liberties; the modern historian sets it in its historical context and assigns to it a much more limited significance. The first use of Magna Charta is the practical one, the second the scientific. We need not restrict the

preacher in his application of a text to the present day, but the commentator will employ quite different standards. Unfortunately for Newman, he wishes his argument to be accepted as academically sound (which it is not) rather than edifying (which it may well be for those who are already convinced).

Sometimes, too, we are asked not merely to read the present back into the past, but to accept the present because there is nothing in the past against it, or because the past can be susceptible of the meaning we would like it to bear. Thus, we are told that "supposing there be otherwise good reason for saying that the Papal Supremacy is part of Christianity, there is nothing in the early history of the Church to contradict it". Here, of course, the question arises: what would have been sufficient to contradict it? One suspects that, in the frame of mind in which Newman wrote the *Essay*, he would have been convinced by nothing short of an explicit repudiation, either in the New Testament or in the Apostolic Fathers. But that is obviously out of the question. Again, when in the letters of Ignatius we find the expression "perfect man" used of Christ, an expression which in the third century has become a dogmatic *terminus technicus*, we are asked "can we doubt that it is dogmatic in Ignatius"? But to quote a parallel from the history of thought in another department, should we be justified in interpreting Locke's use of the word "idea" by Hegel's?

It is indeed difficult to see what could *not* be proved by such a method as this. Newman's error is to use the theory of development to rob the successive phases of the development in question of their intrinsic value and to reduce them to mere means to an end, the present phase. Against this, we must urge the right of the historical method, for which the theology of the Apologists, the Nicene Fathers, the Scholastics, the Reformers, and so on, must be studied in relation to the problems of its time and only thereafter appraised for what it will yield to us. To use an analogy from human life, one ought not to write a biography on the principle that the hero's final success is to be read back into each stage, even into his childhood. Rather should one seek to do justice to childhood, youth, and manhood as each was lived through at the time; so doing, one is able also to show how each had something to contribute to the fully-formed character and the final achievement. The drama of "from Log Cabin to White House" is dissipated once we maintain that the first was implicitly what the second was explicitly.

V

I have devoted this article to a consideration of Newman's thesis because, in my judgment, it is one of the most attractive, and therefore effective, arguments at Rome's disposal today. It is far superior

to the appeal to an oral tradition handed on from the earliest days, since the existence of this can never be proved, whereas the theory of development draws on documents accessible to every student who cares to make their acquaintance. I have tried to show its limitations and fallacies; it now remains to do justice to the elements of truth it contains. Its basic principle of development is admitted by every theologian today; it has become a commonplace when applied to the Old Testament, and is generally acceptable as accounting for the difference between the earliest and the latest parts of the New Testament. No one would write a *History of Dogma* today otherwise than as a study in development. Harnack did not do so, and now Werner certainly does not. To be sure, the pattern of development they trace is not Newman's; their application of the principle is not his, but the principle is the same. How then do we as Protestants come to differ from him so widely?

As I see it, the historical study of the New Testament does not allow us to take it as the starting-point of a single-track development culminating in some present-day type of Christian faith and teaching. The first period of our faith was creative, and it expressed itself in a rich variety of forms held together by a common loyalty to Christ. Its vigorous life threw up images that forbid any attempt at systematization and practices that were sometimes too boldly original to be mutually consistent. The result is that virtually every type of Christianity can find in the New Testament something that justifies its own position. Paul, for example, is an authority for the Lutheran and the Calvinist, the liberal and the sacramentarian, the Catholic and the Pentecostalist. It is idle to deny that there is in the New Testament the suggestion of a special status conferred on Peter; but the subordination of Peter to the Beloved Disciple in the Fourth Gospel implies that there were those who, while accepting his authority, kept it out of the sphere of faith and morals. If Rome can cite the New Testament, so can Wittenberg and Geneva. The question is not: which of us can produce most texts, but: which of us is truest to the spirit of the New Testament as a whole. That is a question for penitence, not for controversy.

Protestantism does not interpret the beginning by the end, it appeals to the origins to determine whether or not the finished product may be recognized as faithful thereto. The mistake it has often made is to employ this criterion in legal fashion, as though nothing were valid today for which a text cannot be found. Such a use of the Bible is self-defeating; for when men are convinced strongly that something is God's will in the present they will twist a text to sanction it rather than surrender it. And in some cases the appeal to the authority of the New Testament will mean simply reading back one's own ideas into it. To assert that the criterion

is the spirit of the New Testament as a whole may seem to advance the matter little further. But if this is understood, not as a body of teaching, but as the communication of Christ Himself, therefore as something to be received in humility and devotion that it may transform our life, have we really any norm but this? Our communion service, for example, is not valid because it confines itself to the language of the New Testament; nor is it invalid because it elaborates this; if Christ meets us in it in forgiveness and renewal, then and only then is it continuous with what happened in the Upper Room.

For Protestantism not only has its own understanding of development, it has its own conception of infallibility. Revelation, as it sees it, is of the same order as life itself. In life we meet God at our own risk, in face of uncertainty and the possibility of great error; sometimes, indeed, we do not find Him, but miss Him. He offers Himself to our freedom; while He surrounds us with signs of His presence, it would be idolatry to equate those signs with the presence. All things God gives us pass, God Himself remains. The Catholic seems to suppose that God has made revelation an exception to life, a special sphere in which a human society, the Church, is at the same time the voice of God and so infallible. We Protestants cannot see it so; all human institutions have authority for us as they acknowledge they are under God, pointers to Him but not more. God comes to us at the place where all human authorities are found transitory and inadequate. Infallibility belongs to Him alone and it is accessible to us, not as information, but in worship, aspiration, and the earnest effort to do His will even while we wait on His mercy for forgiveness.

THE YOUNG MILTON

By Pennar Davies, B.A., B.Litt., Ph.D.

Macaulay, as is well known, suggests in his essay on Milton that the poet combined the best qualities of the 'Royalist', the 'Heathen' and the 'Puritan'. I think that it might be shown that each of these three ways of thinking predominated in one of the three main periods of Milton's life. The 'Royalist' qualities are most conspicuous down to about 1637-9; the humanistic, publicly-minded, 'Heathen' Milton gained the ascendancy from then until about 1660; the passionate 'Puritanism' of the man grew steadily throughout his maturity and reached its full growth after 1660, expressing itself in the later parts of *Paradise Lost,* in *Paradise Regained* and in *Samson Agonistes*. In the two later periods his own distinctive individualistic 'Titanism' makes him tower above other 'Heathens' and 'Puritans', but the Titan does not make his presence felt before *Lycidas*. In the poems written before 1637 there is little trace of the heroic energy that we associate with Milton. All the time the characteristic Milton was being gradually evolved, but on the surface he was being influenced now by one school of thought or literary method and now by another. It has seemed to me worth while to trace the changes.[1]

During the period of the early poems Milton had all the qualities which Macaulay associates with the better sort of Royalist—courtesy, geniality, tenderness, chivalry, elegance, respect for women, love of literature, an interest in both 'profound' and 'polite' learning. His verses on the death of the University Carrier show even a kind of humour, not a humour of ease and urbanity, it is true, but still something very different from the grim Miltonic wit of some of the later prose works; and if his humour was a little laboured there was nothing ponderous about his learning. He was eager, cheerful, even versatile. He had acquired a keen delight in music from his father, and his literary interests were wide and various. He had also, most certainly, that "sentiment of individual independence" which Macaulay attributes to the Royalists, though in his case it arose less from a daring adherence to an ideal of personal honour than from a steady Protestant seriousness which had been another of his father's gifts to him. As Macaulay says, there was a recklessness about the Cavaliers' 'honour' which prevented them for the most part from entering into the merits of

[1] In this sketch of Milton's early development I have not attempted to indicate fully my indebtedness to Milton scholars. My conclusions are based on a personal study of Milton's early works; but for stimulus I owe much to Denis Saurat's *La Pensée de Milton* (1920), E. M. W. Tillyard's *Milton* (1930) and the works of J. H. Hanford, *A Milton Handbook* (1946) and *John Milton, Englishman* (1950).

the political question. Milton's belief in personal independence was serious, thoughtful, almost intellectual, and did not hinder him in later years from thinking about politics with quite exceptional care and seriousness.

If it had not been for this seriousness he would have developed very differently. The Latin poems in particular afford fairly certain evidence that he went through a mawkish period, the time between boyhood and manhood that Keats described in the preface to *Endymion,* the "space of life between, in which the soul is in a ferment, the character undecided, the way of life uncertain, the ambition thick-sighted." The young Milton was not unlike the young Keats, except that there was perhaps in Keats a greater confusion of passions and yearnings. His *Ode to Psyche* might be compared with the *Nativity Ode,* his *Ode to a Nightingale* with *Lycidas,* his *Hyperion* with the first two books of *Paradise Lost.* But through most of the period of his poetic activity he shrank from the principle which dominated Milton's mature work, the principle that true art is of moral import. Of course, Keats could not, in spite of himself, prevent moral forces from invading his work, and before his death was turning away from the cult of self-sufficient beauty indifferent to goodness and truth. He would have acquired, had he lived, a Miltonic insight into the prophetic and heroic nature of art. So much is suggested by *Hyperion.*

When Milton condemned some of his Latin verses in later life it was on moral, not 'artistic', grounds. At the very beginning of his career as a poet his Protestant seriousness showed itself in translations of two of the Psalms, written at the age of fifteen. For its influence on his later development there is plentiful evidence in his defence of his character in the *Apology against "A Modest Confutation of the Animadversions"* of 1642; the following reconstruction of his early work is based in the main on this passage.

After a happy time at St. Paul's School, where he acquired a taste for modern subjects like history and geography, he was disappointed with the degenerate scholasticism which held sway in the Cambridge of 1625. Cambridge was especially opposed to the new Baconian learning, and that Milton was not altogether contented there is clear from his First Latin Elegy. But he grew to like the life better and took an increasing part in it. He was particularly good in the Latin disputations. The Prolusions, beginning possibly about 1627, show that he was a supporter of a progressive humanism and an imaginative Platonism as against scholasticism and Aristotelianism. Yet with this intellectual vitality there went an aesthetic sickliness. This young man of seventeen or eighteen, studious by disposition, reputed to be 'beautiful as a lady', was in love—in love with nothing more substantial than the sensual love poetry of the Latin elegiac poets, of Ovid and Proper-

tius. There is no doubt that in his later life he looked back upon this phase with moral disapproval. And from this later point of view the phase was gravely immoral: it was frivolous. It was akin not so much to the measles of the 'young romantic' as to the insincerity of the 'decadent romantic'. *Contactus nullis ante cupidinibus,* Milton now became a furtive disciple of the young Propertius. If it were not for his reading of Dante and Petrarch and his own stern passion for clear thinking he might have become nothing more than a sort of seventeenth century Musset or Wilde.

Frivolity, the sin which Milton afterwards abhorred above all others, the sin of Eve in *Paradise Lost* and the sin of Dalila in *Samson,* the most wicked of weaknesses, compounded of thoughtlessness, vanity and irresponsibility—frivolity is the controlling mood in more than one of the Latin Elegies. Thus he describes the delights of London in the First Elegy:

Saepe novos illic virgo mirata calores
Quid sit amor nescit, dum quoque nescit, amat . . .
Ah quoties dignae stupui miracula formae
Quae possit senium vel reparare Jovis . . .
Cedite laudatae toties Heroides olim,
Et quaecunque vagum cepit amica Jovem . . .
Quot tibi [sc. Londinio] conspicuae formâque auroque puellae,
Per medias radiant turba videnda vias.

Under the artificial cleverness of poetic efforts of this kind there is an immature knowingness about the things of the flesh and the world. It is the same in the Fifth Elegy:

Nunc etenim toto currit vagus orbe Cupido,
Languentesque fovet solis ab igne faces . . .
Atque aliquam cupidus praedatur Oreada Faunus,
Consulit in trepidos dum sibi Nympha pedes,
Jamque latet, latitansque cupit male tecta videri,
Et fugit, et fugiens pervelit ipsa capi.

The Seventh is avowedly a love poem, in which *astat Amor lecto* throughout:

Nec mora, nunc ciliis haesit, nunc virginis ori,
Insilit hinc labiis, insidet inde genis:
Et quascunque agilis partes jaculator oberrat,
Hei mihi, mille locis pectus inerme ferit.
Protinus insoliti subierunt corda furores,
Uror amans intus, flammaque totus eram.

This is a kind of unhealthy exhilaration like that of Milton's own Adam and Eve after eating the forbidden fruit. It is worth quoting what Milton had to say about his frivolity when he published the Elegies in 1645:

Haec ego mente olim laevâ, studioque supino
Nequitiae posui vana trophaea meae.
Scilicet abreptum sic me malus impulit error,
Indocilisque aetas prava magistra fuit.

One wonders whether he associated his past *nequitia* with Propertius and his striking couplet—

Me sine, quem semper voluit fortuna iacere,
Hanc animam extremae reddere nequitiae.

He confesses to his delight in the Roman elegiac poets in the *Apology,* when he speaks of his study of commended authors at the University—"whereof some were grave orators and historians, whose matter methought I loved indeed, but as my age then was, so I understood them; others were the smooth elegiac poets, whereof the schools are not scarce, whom both for pleasing sound of their numerous writing, which in imitation I found most easy, and most agreeable to nature's part in me, and for their matter, which what it is there be few who know not, I was so allured to read, that no recreation came to me better welcome". His reticence on "their matter, which what it is there be few who know not," is significant.

In 1629, when he was twenty years old, his seriousness asserted itself over his half-poetic, half-prurient mawkishness. He came to feel that he was meant for better things, that there was a high purpose for his artistic powers. The feeling is quite explicit in the poem *In Adventum Veris,* the Fifth Elegy, a curious poem in which, while indulging himself for the last time in amorous fancy and knowing subtleties, Milton lets his fevered imagination run on the dazzling potentialities of the genius which he felt was in him. He asks—

Fallor? an et nobis redeunt in carmina vires,
Ingeniumque mihi munere veris adest?

He feels that spring is coming, for his imagination as well as for the earth:

Castalis ante oculos, bifidumque cacumen oberrat,
Et mihi Pyrenen somnia nocte ferunt.
Concitaque arcano fervent mihi pectora motu,
Et furor, et sonitus me sacer intus agit.
Delius ipse venit, video Penëide lauro
Implicitos crines, Delius ipse venit.
Jam mihi mens liquidi raptatur in ardua coeli,
Perque vagas nubes corpore liber eo.
Perque umbras, perque antra feror penetralia vatum,
Et mihi fana patent interiora Deûm.
Intuiturque animus toto quid agatur Olympo,
Nec fugiunt oculos Tartara caeca meos.
Quid tam grande sonat distento spiritus ore?
Quid parit haec rabies, quid sacer iste furor?

When the reaction against this morbid sensuousness of the imagination came it was, not surprisingly, rather morbid itself. His success in imitating the "smooth elegiac poets" had convinced him that he could write, and he now deliberately, self-consciously,

set about finding a worthier employment for his powers. He says in the *Apology*: "I thought to myself . . . that what emboldened them to this task might with such diligence as they used embolden me; and that what judgment, wit, or elegance was my share, would herein best appear, and best value itself, by how much more wisely and with more love of virtue I should choose . . . the object of not unlike praises." He studied the elegiac poets now less for their alluring matter than for their technical skill, and with something like disgust turned away from them to purer models. "If I found those authors anywhere speaking unworthy things of themselves or unchaste of those names which before they had extolled, this effect it wrought on me, from that time forward their art I still applauded, but the men I deplored; and above them all preferred the two famous renowners of Beatrice and Laura, who never write but honour of them to whom they devote their verse, displaying sublime and pure thoughts, without transgression." Milton now valued a man more than his "art". But his new models were rather unfortunate. Dante he was not mature enough to understand; Petrarch he was not mature enough to resist. He was profoundly impressed, permanently impressed. From them he learnt finally that art is inescapably joined to morality. From them he acquired an extravagant ideal of womanhood which made his later disillusionment the more intense. Perhaps the divorce pamphlets would not have been written if Milton had not read Dante and Petrarch. They strengthened him in his moral purpose, but the particular moral he drew from them he had to outgrow sooner or later. It was a distant ideal of chastity and beauty, a morality of ascetic aestheticism.

At first, perhaps, he did not take his Petrarch so seriously as this. He wrote his five Italian sonnets with the canzone, and his English sonnet to the nightingale: all poems of courtly love in the Petrarchan tradition. As time went on, the ideal of chastity, of private virtue, gained a greater and greater ascendancy over his mind. It was accompanied by a stronger and stronger faith in the morality of art. Whatever else Milton might be he would never again be insincere. "Long it was not after when I was confirmed in this opinion, that he who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things, ought himself to be a true poem; that is a composition and pattern of the best and honorablest things; not presuming to sing praises of heroic men, or famous cities, unless he have in himself the experience and practice of all that is praiseworthy." This is Milton's primary conviction in aesthetics. A poet must be his poem; a man must be his art.

Milton's ambition had now become commensurate with his powers. As early as 1628 (in the *Vacation Exercise*) he had expressed his desire to write an English poem comparable with the

ancient epics. He now became convinced that before he could do that he must perfect himself in personal morality. In the Sixth Elegy of December, 1629, he makes it clear that the slight elegiac form was no longer good enough for him. The epic and the heroic alone could express the spirit of man at his noblest, and to create epic and heroic poetry a man had to train himself arduously and deny himself rigorously like an athlete before a race. The aesthetic life meant to him an ascetic life and an athletic life.

Namque Elegia levis multorum cura deorum est,
Et vocat ad numeros quemlibet illa suos;
Liber adest elegis, Eratoque, Ceresque, Venusque,
Et cum purpureâ matre tenellus Amor.
Talibus inde licent convivia larga poetis,
Saepius et veteri commaduisse mero.
At qui bella refert, et adulto sub Jove caelum,
Heroasque pios, semideosque duces,
Et nunc sancta canit superûm consulta deorum,
Nunc latrata fero regna profunda cane,
Ille quidem parce, Samii pro more magistri
Vivat, et innocuos praebeat herba cibos;
Stet prope fagineo pellucida lympha catillo,
Sobriaque e puro pocula fonte bibat.
Additur huic scelerisque vacans, et casta juventus,
Et rigidi mores, et sine labe manus.
Qualis veste nitens sacrâ, et lustralibus undis
Surgis ad infensos augur iture Deos.

The particular form which his training took at first was conditioned by his feeling that he had to be a Christian poet. The Sixth Elegy alludes explicitly to his *Nativity Ode,* written for Christmas, 1629.

At tu (sc. Carolus Diodatus) si quid agam, scitabere (si modo saltem
Esse putas tanti noscere si quid agam)
Paciferum canimus caelesti semine regem,
Faustaque sacratis saecula pacta libris,
Vagitumque Dei, et stabulantem paupere tecto
Qui suprema suo cum patre regna colit,
Stelliparumque polum, modulantesque aethere turmas,
Et subito elisos ad sua fana Deos.
Dona quidem dedimus Christi natalibus illa,
Illa sub auroram lux mihi prima tulit.

On the 9th of this December Milton had reached twenty-one. He watched his age carefully, and it seems natural to associate the Sixth Elegy and the *Nativity Ode* with a dedication of himself, about the time of his birthday, to the task of doing for Christianity what Homer and Virgil had done for the pagan world. This meant, as the *Nativity Ode* shows, not only a passionate interest in Christian

doctrine but deep regard for the classical and humanistic perception of universal harmony, symbolized by the music of the spheres.[2]

Milton had now found his poetic vocation. As we shall see, he did not pursue it unfalteringly and we find him rededicating himself to it two years later; but the decision had been made.

The two years after Milton made his resolution, about the time of his twenty-first birthday, to become the epic poet of reformed Christianity, were years of indecision. He went the wrong way about his work[3] because he had not yet found his own distinctive insight, his strenuous sense of human responsibility and his emphasis on free will. He set about the task of celebrating what was afterwards to become for him merely the external apparatus of the Christian cosmology, and he did so under the far from stimulating influence of Joshua Sylvester and Giles and Phineas Fletcher. He had read them before, and had used one of Phineas Fletcher's metres in 1626 in the poem "On the Death of a Fair Infant." In the ode, "On the Morning of Christ's Nativity," their influence was clear. The theme had been treated in an ode of Sylvester's and again in Giles Fletcher's *Christ's Victory and Triumph*. In metre and style Milton's poem is in the Spenserian tradition of the Fletchers: in the introduction he uses the stanza of the poem "On the Death of a Fair Infant," and the metre of the Hymn, though apparently original, shows Spenserian influence in the alexandrine. There is also, of course, the influence of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue; in his Latin reading Milton had come to prefer Virgil to the elegiac poets. But the ingenuity of thought and elaboration of treatment are due perhaps more to his reading of the Fletchers than to his study of Virgil. Nothing could be more Fletcherian than the decision he apparently made to celebrate the events of Jesus' life at the appropriate seasons of the year. The only products of this plan were the poem "Upon the Circumcision" and "The Passion" (April, 1630). There is little energy in either of these. Milton was evidently forcing himself to write on sacred themes. The poems "On Time" and "At a Solemn Music," which were written about the same time, are much more interesting. There is nothing profound about them, but they did apparently arise from a genuine desire for poetic and rhythmic expression. Perhaps we should associate them more with Milton's Italian studies than with his self-conscious imitation of the Fletchers. Professor E. M. W. Tillyard[4] suggests that in form they were modelled on the *canzone*.

As yet he was far more at home in the classical tradition, and,

[2] This is pointed out by Arthur Barker in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, January, 1941 ("The Pattern of Milton's Nativity Ode").

[3] It is suggested by A. S. P. Woodhouse ("Notes on Milton's Early Development" in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, October, 1943) that Milton relapsed into poetic eroticism and that some of the erotic verse may have been written after December, 1629.

[4] In his *Milton* (London, 1930), p. 62.

perhaps in spite of himself, he was drawn during the summer of 1631 into some essays in the more classical manner of the school of Jonson. This group of poems includes the song "On May Morning", "On Shakespeare", "An Epitaph on the Marchioness of Winchester", "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso."[5] The poem on Shakespeare was written for the Second Folio of Shakespeare published in 1632, and so Milton's date (1630) is perhaps too soon. The Marchioness of Winchester died in April 1631. The whole group differs from the preceding one in the Jonsonian plainness and directness of the style. The most significant fact about them is that not one is written on a sacred subject. Milton knew that he had failed in his verses on the Circumcision and the Passion. In "L'Allegro" there is a relapse into lightheartedness, though not into frivolity. And then, in the following December, he again came to himself and realized that he was twenty-three years old and as far as ever from his ambition. Deeply moved he wrote the grave and patently sincere sonnet "How soon hath Time." He who had hailed with such excitement the coming of spring now felt that it was already late spring with him and yet there was no sign of bud or blossom or inward ripeness. He committed himself to a Providence that he felt was just:

> All is, if I have grace to use it so,
> As ever in my great task-master's eye.

He now devoted himself wholly to the study and the self-discipline which he thought were necessary to the writing of great poetry. He concentrated most intensely on the literature that seemed likely to help him most, the tales of knighthood, and especially the interpretations and moralizations upon them that had been produced by the Renaissance. Late in 1632 he began his life at Horton and threw himself into a protracted course of intensive study, especially in history, but he continued to read eagerly the romances of chivalry in the verses of the Renaissance poets. And he was fascinated by their idealism. "I betook me to those fables and romances, which recount in solemn cantos the deeds of knighthood founded by our victorious kings, and from hence in renown all over Christendom. There I read it in the oath of every knight that he should defend to the expense of his best blood, if so befell him, the honour and chastity of virgin or matron. . . . This my mind gave me, that every free and gentle spirit, without that oath, ought to be born a knight, nor needed to expect the gilt spur or the laying of a sword upon his shoulder to stir him both by his counsel and his arms to secure and protect the weakness of any attempted chastity." Milton had now passed

[5] I accept Tillyard's view (English Association Pamphlet No. 82, July, 1932) that "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" belong not to the Horton but to the Cambridge period.

from the followers of Spenser to Spenser himself. The *Faerie Queene* was in a sense the national epic of England, and it wrought on Milton a far greater effect than the other epics of chivalry. How much Spenser inspired him may be guessed from the praise of him in the *Areopagitica*—"our sage and serious poet Spenser, whom I dare be known to think a better teacher than Scotus or Aquinas." He especially revered Spenser for his exaltation of the private virtues, Temperance, Holiness, Friendship and Chastity, for his Platonic belief in a heavenly beauty perceptible only by the soul in a state of holiness, and perhaps above all for his emphasis (particularly in Book I of the *Faerie Queene*) on the glory of moral striving. Milton came to believe that redemption came by the conquest of temptation through the exercise of will. When he treats the grand theme of *Paradise Regained* he tells us not of the Passion, but of the conquest of evil by Christ's holy will in the episode of the Temptation.

Milton progressed naturally from the study of Spenser to the study of Plato. "Thus from the laureate fraternity of poets riper years and the ceaseless round of studies led me to the shady spaces of philosophy; but chiefly to the divine volumes of Plato and Xenophon: where if I should tell ye what I learned of chastity and love, I mean of that which is truly so, whose charming cup is only virtue, which she bears in her hand to those who are worthy. . . ." He must have given special study to books in which Plato and Xenophon represent Socrates discussing love and virtue, especially the *Symposium*. He had left his earlier conception of love far behind. Now he cared only for Plato's love. Now he understood "how the first and chiefest office of love ends in the soul, producing those two happy twins of her divine generation, knowledge and virtue." He followed Spenser in his mingling of Platonic love and Christian chastity. He joined Christianity and Platonism in his belief in the Heavenly Bridegroom: Christian chastity on earth is rewarded by a Platonic union with the Bridegroom. There was something aesthetic, something almost sensuous, about his veneration of chastity. St. Paul's teachings on male chastity (as in *I Corinthians,* vi, 13-20) wrought powerfully upon him. "Having had the doctrine of holy scripture unfolding those chaste and high mysteries, with timeliest care infused, that 'the body is for the Lord and the Lord for the body', thus also I argued to myself, that if unchastity in a woman, whom St. Paul terms the glory of man, be such a scandal and dishonour, then certainly in a man who is both the image and glory of God, it must, though commonly not so thought, be much more deflowering and dishonourable in that he sins both against his own body, which is the perfecter sex, and his own glory, which is the woman; and that which is worst, against

the image and glory of God, which is in himself." The Scriptures also told him of the reward of chastity, the joining with Christ: "Nor did I slumber over that place expressing such high rewards of ever accompanying the Lamb, with those celestial songs to others incomprehensible, but not to those who were not defiled with women."

It is likely that Milton let his thoughts dwell more on the beauty of chastity in women than in men. Freudians might explain the almost sensuous exaltation of feminine chastity in *Comus* as a sort of compensation for Milton's own repressions. In any case the whole subject of chastity and love and their Christian reconciliation became almost an obsession. There must have been something ghost-like about his life at this time. It must have been a life of long imaginative communings with the shades of Spenser and Dante and Plato and St. John and St. Paul. The *Comus* of 1634 was the product of an unhealthy preoccupation. If the Lady in *Comus* was what Milton thought women should be it is no wonder that he ended by thinking that they were in reality like Dalila in *Samson Agonistes*. And so intensely did he feel the beauty of purity and the purity of beauty that he had to express what he felt even in a work so "occasional" as a masque. Thus he produced of all masques the most thoughtful, the most surcharged with deep personal feeling.

Milton enshrined all his most recent thought in *Comus*. All human purity, as well as feminine chastity, is exalted in the Lady; and her outward beauty, as the Platonists taught, was the reflection of her inward purity. She has the ministration of angels as the reward of virtue—

> Till oft converse with heav'nly habitants
> Begin to cast a beam on th'outward shape,
> The unpolluted temple of the mind,
> And turns it by degrees to the soul's essence,
> Till all be made immortal.

The doctrine, that the soul can maintain its purity of itself and not as a gift of divine grace, is also present. Divine providence can assist the soul, but only after the victory has been morally won. Thyrsis can free the Lady only after she has defeated the tempter. The Elder Brother, with his belief in the invincibility of true virtue, is a true Platonic thinker. The Christian interpretation of Platonic love is symbolized at the end of the masque by the marriage of the Soul (Psyche) with the Celestial Cupid, and their joy is contrasted with the poor disappointment of earthly love as represented by the mourning Venus. Yet perhaps Milton is hinting that the heavenly love of the pure soul may be born of earthly love by some process of sublimation; for Cupid is the son of Venus and Christ is man as well as God.

> . . . Young Adonis oft reposes,
> Waxing well of his deep wound
> In slumber soft, and on the ground
> Sadly sits th'Assyrian Queen;
> But far above in spangled sheen
> Celestial Cupid, her fam'd son advanc'd,
> Holds his dear Psyche sweet intranc'd
> After her wandering labours long,
> Till free consent the gods among
> Make her his eternal Bride,
> And from her fair unspotted side
> Two blissful twins are to be born,
> Youth and Joy; so Jove hath sworn.

Comus is morbid in inhumanity. Here the contrast with Spenser is inescapable. Spenser is sweet and wistful where Milton is stern and impassive. Many have found Una a lovable lady as well as the personification of Truth. There is nothing lovable about the Lady in *Comus*. She is the personification of Chastity,[6] redeemed from mere didacticism only by the throwing over her of a kind of magic veil of sanctity. Nothing can consume the holy distance between us and her. There is none of the pitying intimacy or the smiling delicacy of Spenser. Milton's virtue is remote, inaccessible, preternatural, to be revered with caught breath and bowed head. His asceticism had become almost a straining after death itself. No wonder he found difficulty in writing: he was heading for complete artistic extinction.

Two things saved him from the consequences of his dangerous experiment with asceticism and negative virtue. One was a sudden realization of the fact of death. The other was a call away from the embattled security of private virtue to the daring valour of public virtue. In truth, the impossible virtue exalted in *Comus* was as inimical to life as the sexual cravings and irresponsibilities of Propertius and Ovid. Milton's condemnation of a safe and unadventurous purity in the *Areopagitica* is well known—the "fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat." Literally understood, the virtue in *Comus* is certainly not of the fugitive and cloistered kind, for it vanquishes its adversary. But there is no real dust and heat. The conflict seems unreal. The Lady's purity, in spite of all temptation and in spite of the limited role assigned to heavenly grace, is never in any real danger. It is protected by a kind of magic self-sufficiency. It knows its own security; and so it is not afraid and it is not valiant.

[6] This judgment is not affected by the consideration emphasized by E. M. W. Tillyard ("The Action of Comus" in *Essays and Studies*, 1943), that chastity in *Comus* is not everywhere to be identified with virginity.

It was the passing of his friend Edward King that brought home to Milton, with a shock, the rude reality of death, the dread possibility that a dedicated poet might be cut off before the completion of his course of self-discipline. Writing *Lycidas* in 1637 Milton took comfort in the prospect of fulfilment and fame in heaven. But beneath the words of consolation may be detected an abiding fear, the fear that his own thin-spun life might be slit by the blind Fury with the abhorred shears. There was much to do; there was no time to be wasted in the leisurely cultivation of the private virtues. The negative virtues were to be subservient to a positive mission. He had work to do. The nature of that work grew clearer as he looked out into the world and beheld its corruption. How vain was the luxury of a studiously-cultivated private virtue in the midst of this nightmare of blind mouths. There was work for him to do, work for a hero of public valour. The two-handed engine stood ready at the door. He realized what his function must be. He must be a public poet, like the Hebrew prophets and the orators of Greece and Rome. He must be a noble exemplar of public virtue, be "of power, beside the office of a pulpit, to imbreed and cherish in a great people the seeds of virtue and public civility." So he wrote in the *Reason of Church Government* of 1641, when he had finally become the second Milton, the 'humanist', the 'heathen', the exponent of public liberty in the manner of the ancients.

Lycidas is the stern catharsis in which Milton purified himself of the corruption of his purity, and purified himself by tragic pity and tragic fear; pity for the drowned youth and fear of the blind Fury, pity for the sheep that were not fed and fear of the blind mouths and the lean and flashy songs that grated on their scrannel pipes of wretched straw. *Lycidas* is an end and a beginning, the work of a dedicated student and a roused patriot, a combination of the most elaborate artifice and the most intense passion. As he wrote it Milton saw clearly what he must do next. There must be an end to his life of seclusion and study. Life was too short.

Tomorrow to fresh woods and pastures new.

In Italy he regained the health of his soul. When he returned he was ready for the strife, a young athlete ready for the dust and the heat.

Even critics of the Anglo-Catholic persuasion have in recent years been making amends for the thoughtless or tendentious disparagement of Milton that was once somewhat fashionable; and Mr. T. S. Eliot in his British Academy Lecture of 1947 speaks of his "consummate powers." It is proper that Christians of another tradition should now approach his work with the respect due to one who could pour profound thought and conviction into moulds of splendid artistry.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea: a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY
AND RELEVANT STUDIES

A History of the London Missionary Society, 1895-1945. By NORMAN GOODALL. 640 pp. Oxford University Press. 42s.

The writing of an "official" history is a very difficult task. The period to be covered, determined by artificial boundaries, may have no inherent historical unity. It must be comprehensively treated to serve many purposes and interests; the historian's normal freedom to select and omit is thereby considerably limited. The task may well daunt any author who is not content to be a mere compiler. The London Missionary Society entrusted the task of writing the history of the third half-century of its existence to Dr. Norman Goodall, and he has accomplished it with great distinction. From a mass of what must have been most unpromising material, minutes, reports and letters, Dr. Goodall has produced an orderly, lucid and withal eminently readable narrative, treating each field (including the "home base") in turn, and describing the Society's work in each on broadly chronological lines.

He has had this advantage that, as Dr. Latourette points out in the Foreword he contributes, "the years since 1895 are, by a strange and striking coincidence, a distinct period in their own right" (pp. v-vi). This has helped the author to set the story of the Society's work in the context of the social and political changes of the period; in doing so, his well-nigh unerring eye for the main issue and his gift of balanced yet compressed exposition are put to full use. He has not allowed the broad sweep of these more impersonal aspects of events to obscure what he rightly describes as "that great succession of personal service which is the most distinctive feature of a missionary society's witness" (p. 10). His vignettes of the service of individual missionaries are marked by wise and discriminating understanding. The skill with which, to a remarkable extent, he avoids the almost inevitable impression of a catalogue in these sections of the narrative evokes admiration, even if art does not here entirely succeed in concealing the art required. A postscript bring the narrative in outline to the present day. Appendices include a note on sources, and lists of missionaries, officers and staff. Amidst the mass of facts here recorded, it will be surprising if some errors are not detected as the book is used. The reviewer's knowledge has not enabled him so far to detect any, despite his best efforts (unless indeed, it be counted an error to record the withdrawal from China without mentioning the reason for it (p. 583)).

But this history is far more than an accurate, balanced and readable account of the activities of the L.M.S. during fifty years. Dr. Goodall has

drawn out from the record of events the main features of missionary policy, has related them to the experience of other societies, and has expounded them with much theological insight. He finds in the emergence of the younger churches the distinctive and unifying theme of the period, and assesses for each field the extent to which the aim to plant "self-supporting, self-governing and self-propagating" churches has been achieved. He gives considerable attention to the question "what pattern of Church order" such churches would "assume in the light of the Fundamental Principle" of the Society (p. 8). The concluding part of the volume includes a record of the educational and medical work of the Society and a discussion of the policy underlying it (chapters 11 and 12). Chapter 14 discusses the growth of co-operation between missions—a notable feature of the period—and Chapter 15 the very topical subject "The Voluntary Society and the Church".

The book is therefore a contribution of great value in many spheres—in the fundamental discussion of missionary policy of far wider reference than one Society; in the Church history (and therefore in the social history) of a significant epoch; in the consideration of the nature of the Church, especially with reference to its calling both to mission and unity. The author's choice of material and allocation of space are bound to be questioned by some. Others may find the unvarying perfection of style a trifle cloying, and may share the reviewer's wish that just once or twice Dr. Goodall would say something crudely or bluntly. But every reader will recognize in this work's literary skill, historical judgment and theological perception, a major achievement. R. K. ORCHARD.

The Rediscovery of the Bible. By WILLIAM NEIL. 255 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

This is an excellent book on the study of the Bible written for "any who are interested in the world we have to live in, particularly for those who are wondering whether the Bible has still anything to say to us about it", as well as for students and teachers interested in Religious Education. The first part (pp. 9-115) is an admirably lucid analysis of all the factors which form part of our understanding of the Bible—the problems of the modern world, the new understanding of the historical meaning of the records, the contribution of archaeology, the newer emphasis upon theological interpretation, the relation between the Bible and the life of the Church. All this is honestly and helpfully set forth, and constitutes the best general introduction to the Bible which the reviewer knows.

The second part of the book (pp. 117-255), entitled 'The Emergent Picture', is a historical reconstruction of the events which underlie the Biblical record. This is competently done, but is less helpful than the earlier part because in the re-discovery of the Bible there are two major issues which still need exploration: 1. With what assumptions—theological and practical—do we most profitably read the Bible? 2. On the basis of having assimilated what scholars and theologians have taught us, how do we in fact read the Bible? If these questions have been answered, then we can sit down in comfort to look at Dr. Neil's picture; if they have not, Dr. Neil's picture is likely to prove unsatisfying.

The author says (pp. 29-30), 'What we are entitled to call the re-discovery of the Bible is a process which is only in its infancy, and anything said about it must be treated as an interim report on work which is likely to produce more striking results in coming years than even those already achieved'. In a sense this is fair enough. But until the labours of scholars and theologians have actually reached the average Christian in a positive and dynamic way, it seems wiser and less frustrating simply to

claim that the Re-discovery of the Bible is near at hand, and that we may confidently expect that it will soon be here. It has not yet arrived.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Back to the Bible. By H. G. G. HERKLOTS. 174 pp. Benn. 12s. 6d.

This is a good popular account of "how we got our Bible". Canon Herklots describes in plain language the long process of centuries: the writing of the ancient manuscripts, the age of printing, and modern discoveries down to the recent finds in the Dead Sea area. There is a good deal of interesting and sometimes rather out-of-the-way information, especially about some of the early and Medieval versions. One of the most useful features of the book is the chronological table at the end which enables the reader to pass in review the history of the transmission of the Bible he has just finished reading. My main criticism is of the ill-chosen title, which is so liable to suggest fundamentalist propaganda.

A. J. B. HIGGINS.

Personal Experience and the Historic Faith. By A. VICTOR MURRAY. 304 pp. Epworth Press. 16s.

This is a new edition of the 1939 Fernley-Hartley Lecture, which the author has not found it possible to re-write as much as he would have liked. It offers an analysis of Christian experience and of the Gospel which evokes and controls it. How does the historically enacted Gospel evoke in modern man a response of love answering to the love of Jesus and the love of God, and adequate to the nature and the need of man? President Murray neatly portrays man in the setting of nature, personal intercourse and history. He then extracts from the Old and the New Testaments the illumination which bears on man thus portrayed, the two chapters being separated by his portrait of Jesus Christ. Then he considers the Christian response and its discipline under five headings: feeling, knowing, choosing, doing, belonging. His last chapter, on "the love of Jesus and the vision of God", brings out the heart of the matter, as the author sees it. The book is admirably designed to nourish and to re-form the personal faith of intelligent Christians in accordance with that assessment of the Biblical message and of Christian tradition offered by scholars of liberal mind and large sympathies a generation ago, when the Barthian map of the spiritual world could be described as Nazi Germany inverted (p. 42), and when all that is relevant in the Old Testament is its tradition of prophecy and piety. I wish the President had taken the measure of all the factors which have conspired to make his own map unduly neat and convenient. His integrity, his lively faith and his power to give of himself in print are all manifest in this book; but the task to which he so bravely addressed himself in 1939 has become more daunting and more exacting now that trends which he felt free to ignore then have come to occupy the centre of the theological stage.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

The Parables of Jesus. By JOACHIM JEREMIAS. S.C.M. 178 pp. 16s.

The reputation of Prof. Jeremias of Göttingen is already high among New Testament scholars and it is good to have this means of becoming better acquainted with his work. This English translation constitutes the third edition of his study of the parables and reproduces the second (1952) with slight emendations. Dodd's contribution to our understanding of the parables is fully recognized: "it is unthinkable that there ever be any retreat from the essential lines laid down by Dodd for the interpretation of the parables of Jesus". What Jeremias offers is a thorough re-examination of the Gospel material marked by acute penetration and great linguistic

knowledge, especially on the Aramaic side. More than one parable comes freshly alive because the significance of some detail is brought out for the first time.

Jeremias first concerns himself with the literary-historical problem of penetrating behind the treatment of the parables by the early Church to the original setting in the ministry of Jesus. The first Christians understandably enough applied them to their own circumstances, which were different from those of Jesus, and thus accretions arose which the critic must strip away in order to ascertain the original reference and meaning. Jeremias calls this "the return to Jesus from the primitive Church". This need had already been shown by Dodd, but Jeremias brings new evidence. He points out how what Jesus had intended purely eschatologically came to be treated as exhortation; generalizing conclusions were added; and parables originally addressed to opponents or to the general public were read as referring to the Christian community. He also proves that the handling of the parables as allegories (e.g. Mark iv, 13-20) had set in before Mark. The second half of the book is more constructive. It classifies and expounds the teaching of the parables, as far as possible in the actual words of Jesus, in the conviction that "our task is a return to the actual living voice of Jesus. . . . To meet with him can alone give power to our preaching".

The translation by S. H. Hooke is very good; but surely denarii looks more at home in our language than dinars. E. C. Blackman.

The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. Reginald H. Fuller. 128 pp. S.C.M. 8s.

Life in Christ. Theo. Preiss (translated by Harold Knight). 104 pp. S.C.M. 7s.

The monographs in the "Studies in Theology" series, now well established, have already made available some recent work of British, American and Continental scholars. These two new volumes maintain the high standard set in the first eleven issues.

Mr. Fuller, of St. David's College, Lampeter, begins with a critique of Rudolf Bultmann's radical reconstruction of the history of Jesus in his *Theology of the New Testament*. He cannot agree with Bultmann's contention that it was only after the Resurrection that the Church identified Jesus as the Messiah and that the traditional material in the Gospels represents a reshaping by later generations. Mr. Fuller, while rejecting "realized eschatology" (after a careful examination of many passages), argues that to interpret Jesus as "an eschatological prophet who simply announced the impending advent of the eschatological Reign of God" is an entirely inadequate reconstruction. The truth is rather that Jesus conceived it to be His mission to provide by His death the occasion through and in which God would inaugurate that Reign. There are in the teaching of Jesus "the raw materials of Christology" and these are discussed in an important chapter which deals with the titles Son of God, Servant, Son of Man, Christos, Kyrios, and Son of David. The value of this little book is out of all proportion to its size.

The late Théo. Preiss, who was a French Reformed Church pastor, is represented in five useful essays selected from chapters of his *La Vie en Christ* bound together by the interesting theme of "juridical mysticism" which he found not only in Paul but in other parts of the New Testament and especially in the Fourth Gospel. His treatment is fresh and marked by some memorable epigrams and summaries. The essays are on "Justification in Johannine Thought", "Life in Christ and Social Ethics in the Epistle to Philemon", "The Mystery of the Son of Man" (an original approach to

the parable of the "Last Judgment" in Matt. xxv, 31-46), "The Vision of History in the New Testament", and "Was the Last Supper a Paschal Meal?" (in which he examines the various traditions and chronologies and sees in each "a Meal with a Paschal theme"). All this is stimulating reading which makes one wish that there had been more to come from this writer.

W. Gordon Robinson.

The Faith that Rebels. By D. S. Cairns. 260 pp. S.C.M. 9s.

A sixth edition of this book, first published in 1928, is amply justified. The late Prof. Donald Baillie contributed a Foreword which introduces it to a new generation of readers. As he says, a great deal has happened in the theological world since the nineteen twenties, but this exegesis of the mighty works of Jesus and their place in the tradition about Jesus is still of the greatest value. "The Gospel theory of the 'miracles' of Jesus is that they are the answers of God to the prayers of the Ideal Son, the Man who is the supreme instance in history of Faith, Hope, and Love" (p. 85). What is to be held and taught about the possibility of such things happening? Can we believe that "a Personality unique in greatness and goodness can have any greater influence for good on the world of Nature" than is the case with those of meaner character? Dr. Cairns' exposition of Faith and its appeal to the Power of God, His Love and His Freedom to help men is tremendously moving and illuminating. Exegetically, one would expect today a more positive use of the eschatology of Jesus. Philosophically, the attack on the "closed Nature" concept would have to be framed more carefully, and the appeal to a ground in "the best modern Theistic thought" with an "educative" evaluation of the tragic elements in experience may be deemed to weaken the book. But the main contention for a Nature which is plastic in the hands of God, and therefore prospectively in the hands of believing men, is finely stated.

W. A. Whitehouse.

Chapters in a Life of Paul. By John Knox. 168 pp. A. & C. Black. 12s. 6d.

Interpreting Paul's Gospel. By A. M. Hunter. 144 pp. S.C.M. 10s. 6d.

Professor Knox offers a reconstruction of Pauline chronology on the assumption that Paul's epistles themselves are our primary authority and Acts only secondary. Few scholars have applied this principle more systematically. Knox puts Paul's conversion between 34 and 37 A.D. and the bulk of his missionary work between the 1st and 2nd visits to Jerusalem, i.e. between 37 or 40 and 51. The 2nd visit was for the Conference (Gal. ii, Acts xv) and was followed by the raising of the collection in the Gentile churches. Allowing two years for that, Knox gets 53 or 54 as the date of the final visit to Jerusalem. Thus everything is brought forward in date, including the Epistles; Thessalonians could be as early as 40. It is a real merit to have filled up the "silent years" (Gal. i, 18; ii, 1), but two difficulties remain: a. The Conference is dated too long after Paul's earliest activity among Gentiles, and Luke's placing of it after the first Journey is more probable; b. The Delphi inscription dates Gallio's proconsulship 51-2, and requires 50-51 as the date of Paul's arrival at Corinth. Knox has to throw doubt on Acts xviii and suggest that Paul either did not appear before Gallio at all, or else on a subsequent visit.

There is far more in this book than chronology. Half of it is interpretation of Paul's experience. Knox has splendid things to say about the Resurrection in relation to the Church's experience of the living Christ, and about how forgiveness is experienced. He allows Paul to have had the genuine experience, but deplores the inadequacy of his explanation of it.

Dr. Hunter has no new theory to commend and is not so bold as Knox to express disapproval of apostolic opinions. His book is an admirably balanced summary of Paul's theology interpreted round the central idea of salvation. It is written with Hunter's usual lucidity and forthrightness. Nothing vital in scholarship has been missed, and above all it has the feeling of what are the priorities for the preacher, more especially in the second half, which expounds the relevance of Paul for today and demonstrates that Paul is no "extinct volcano". We have some queries about the final chapter on the Hope of glory. Hunter seems to hold that before the End comes all men must respond to the preaching of the Gospel. That can only mean one particular generation; what then of previous generations? Hunter will not allow universalism to be a Pauline belief. And what about Christians of all previous generations in the interval between their death and Judgment, or death and the End? A word or two might have been said about II Cor. v, 1-5. E. C. BLACKMAN.

Notes on the Hebrew Text of I Kings XVII-XIX and XXI-XXII. By NORMAN H. SNAITH. 109 pp. Epworth. 10s. 6d.

This is the latest volume in the series edited and written by Dr. Snaith. It has all the good qualities of its predecessors, with the added advantage of a vocabulary. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the value of this volume to the beginner in Hebrew, especially if he has to work without the help of a teacher. The notes are brief, and go a long way towards clarifying the difficulties of Hebrew Grammar. Another merit is that the frequent references to the text-books are not confined solely to one book, but to works most likely to be in the hands of a beginner. Mnemonic devices are employed which should lighten the work of the student.

JAMES WOOD.

A History of Christianity in Yorkshire. Edited by F. S. POPHAM. 160 pp. R.E.P. 8s. 6d.

This book is designed as a supplement to the Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education for Yorkshire. It succeeds admirably in its aim to be a county ecclesiastical history in miniature. Its successive chapters recount the history of Christianity in early Yorkshire, in the late Middle Ages, during the Reformation, in the Post-Reformation period, and in accounts of the 'Old Dissent' (Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists), the Society of Friends, Roman Catholicism, the Moravians, and the Methodists. It is, in effect, a roll-call of the Yorkshire heroes of faith. Some of them, notably Grimshaw, evangelical vicar of the Brontesque village of Haworth, had the qualities that we associate with Yorkshiremen today. He was a character of great strength, and of a blunt integrity. Once, it appears, he caused his congregation to sing through the almost interminable 119th Psalm, while he left the church in pursuit of truant Christians with his horsewhip. On another occasion, when a visiting evangelist was congratulating his congregation on having such a Christian incumbent, Grimshaw interrupted the discourse with the stentorian rebuke, "No, sir, don't flatter them; they are most of them going to Hell with their eyes open."

Yorkshire makes up a most impressive contribution to the communion of saints and this book includes necessarily brief references to Bede, Rolle of Hampole, Wycliffe, Coverdale, William Wilberforce, Hook, Venn, Oliver Heywood, Dan Taylor, John Nelson, Oastler, and H. H. Asquith (the two latter were educated at the Moravian School at Fulneck).

The outstanding essay is that on the late Middle Ages by G. R. Dunston, Lecturer at Ripon Hall. Its freshness of research produces a most lively series of unforgettable cameos. For the rest, one may say that they make

the conventional sources of information interesting. I noticed only one serious contradiction. P. 56 informs us that the Puritans "had little influence on this part of England." On p. 58 the same author states that "many of the clergy were Puritans at heart." On the whole, this pioneer venture is warmly to be welcomed and imitated. HORTON DAVIES.

Methodism and the Struggle of the Working Classes, 1850-1900. By R. F. WEARMOUTH. 269 pp. Backus, Leicester. 21s.

Dr. Wearmouth's present volume is marked by the same painstaking labour and the infectious enthusiam for his subject which were characteristic of his earlier works. Sometimes indeed one or the other of these qualities carries him away, as when he gives us no less than 131 recorded deaths by starvation where six would have done, or where he lets himself go in his enthusiasm for his Primitive Methodist heroes. The book is excellent journalism, well-documented, and most entertaining and informative. It is interesting to notice in this period how Wesleyans were mainly Tories and Primitive Methodists almost to a man Liberal and Labour. This may indicate one of those non-theological factors in the relations of the Churches which nowadays worry the World Council. A word should be said in praise of the enterprise of the provincial publisher of this book. It is well set up in every way and a credit to him as well as to the author.

The Golden String. By BEDE GRIFFITHS. 168 pp. Harvill. 12s. 6d.

This is an account of the spiritual pilgrimage of an incurable romantic who is now a monk in a Roman Catholic monastery. It is so naïve in its outlook that one cannot be offended by the slight tinge of smugness which every Roman convert exhibits when he gets down to autobiography. The author while at Oxford fell under the spell of C. S. Lewis, which prevented him from becoming the victim of the sceptical humanism which assailed him at that time. But he thought himself to be in revolt against modern industry and so he twice took up a romantic life in a remote cottage with milk and porridge, tallow dips, home-made crockery and a black-letter Bible. His reading never got beyond the eighteenth century and preferably in folios, and he never came to grips with any fundamental theological problem. But he has written a charming account of a literary and artistic man's inevitable drift towards Rome. A. V. MURRAY.

The Image of God in Sex. By VINCENT WILKIN. Sheed and Ward. 88 pp. 6s.

This is an interpretation of marriage in which mysticism runs riot. The theme is that a man and woman are bound together by their marriage vows in much the same way as the Church is to Christ, and just as the former is subservient to the latter, so the woman is to her husband: she surrenders herself to him in complete and utter devotion. I doubt whether a thinking woman would ever subscribe to such a conception of marriage, because she knows that no man is as mature as Christ was, and because to submit absolutely to another personality is not only to surrender one's freedom but to hazard the chances of living victoriously. The author contends that this mystical relationship is not merely an ideal to be aimed at, but actually exists among some people. My experience of people who are supposed to enjoy this marital bliss is not very convincing as to their stability as 'live personalities', and I doubt whether such a pattern of marriage is either generally practicable or desirable. Besides, if marriage is to survive at the expense of one or other of the personalities involved, there is something wrong with it as an institution. A more realistic view is that both husband and wife are co-partners. There is room in marriage for wise and healthy

leadership, but this should alternate from the one to the other as circumstances require; when it does the marriage is not only vital but successful.

Divorce and Remarriage. By HUGH C. WARNER. Allen and Unwin. 91 pp. 4s. 6d.

Canon Warner writes to defend the position of the Anglican Church against Sir Alan Herbert's view that where divorce and remarriage are concerned the Church should come into alignment with the State. The author presents a historical development of the Marcan reference to divorce; but one wonders whether Christ's attitude would now be that of those who refuse to remarry divorced people in the House of His Father. Canon Warner seems to overlook the fact that adultery is almost invariably the rationalizing of a serious disparity between two unhappy people. Adultery *per se* is rarely the real cause for divorce, for where there is love there is forgiveness. It would be useful to look behind the apparent reason for the real dynamic factors which have disrupted love, those factors which, unless resolved, lead either to perpetual disharmony or to divorce.

W. E. SARGENT.

A Scientist of the Invisible. By A. P. SHEPHERD. 222 pp. Hodder & Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

You will Survive Death. By SHERWOOD EDDY. 175 pp. Omega Press, Reigate, Surrey. 12s. 6d.

Each of these books puts a case for a "spiritual" interpretation of man and his environment, based on a "scientific" approach to abnormal phenomena. Rudolf Steiner's Anthroposophy, which is Dr. Shepherd's subject, and psychic phenomena upon which Dr. Eddy reports, reveal uncharted possibilities in the human situation to which attention must be paid sooner or later. In both cases, what is suggested is extremely disturbing to sober Christian thinking, but an obscurantist resistance to it will not do. Dr. Shepherd gives an excellent, if uncritical, account of Steiner's solitary cultivation of the Gnostic way in the modern world. He recognizes that it is necessary to commend the man if he is to commend the teaching, but his six biographical chapters leave room for some reservation of personal confidence. "The Message" begins from an anthropology which explains our ability (normally atrophied) to raise consciousness to a higher level at which "higher worlds" become manifest. The history of the cosmos is then known as a *Heilsgeschichte* somewhat wider in scope and different in shape from that suggested otherwise, and the evolution of the individual is seen to require a process of reincarnations. What is said about Christ, who was incarnate once for all, is impeccably orthodox (p. 138). This is followed by a discussion of the history of thought, for in the Christian era "the spirit-initiation of mankind by Christ" is being completed by "a redemption of human thinking." Two more chapters indicate the application of Spiritual Science to Education, Healing, the State and Agriculture. The anthroposophical way seems to me to be insidiously totalitarian (p. 166), but in its fashion it is sensitive and responsible. If it should catch on, Steiner may rank among the very great heretics. Irenaeus alone will not suffice to deal with him, but the work of that theologian is greatly illuminated by this modern version of the esoteric wisdom which he had to meet in the second century. "A mere hurried reading of the presentation of Rudolf Steiner's teaching can only result—in self-defence—in a sceptical rejection of it," says Dr. Shepherd (p. 208). I am afraid that is so, but I admire the presentation.

Psychical research is a puzzling business and one is grateful that philosophers (like Prof. H. H. Price) are prepared to deal with it soberly

and seriously. Dr. Sherwood Eddy has dealt with it earnestly and his material is skilfully arranged to impress the reader. Much of what he reports has strictly no bearing on the agency of "surviving spirits." But his dealings with Father Tobe, in life a doctor of philosophy who lived in Ireland, persuaded Dr. Eddy that this agency is real. Father Tobe's theology, the ideas of which "are poles apart from that of the medium" (p. 140), seems to have affinities with that of Dr. Eddy, who evidently feels justified in this kind of spiritual probing when it is done with proper reserve. Dr. Eddy makes some parade of his reserve and of his Christian faith, which is evidently unaffected by all that he has discovered. A proper theology of supranormal possibilities is a necessary part of Christian teaching, but I for one am bound to confess that it is hard to work it out in relation to the experiences which lie behind these two books. Perhaps we should wait for the scientists and philosophers to tell us more about how all this falls into the realm of the "natural" before revising our understanding of God and the powers of His supernatural Kingdom.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

The Advancement of Science, Vol. XI, No. 43, Dec., 1954. The British Association. 112 pp. 7s. 6d.

The Advancement of Science is a quarterly, but this particular number is of special interest in that it embodies the reports of the meeting of the British Association held at Oxford in September, 1954. The addresses and papers printed as articles seem to have been chosen with a view to their appeal to the general reader as well as to the specialist, and the following may be specially cited: The Study of the Seasons, by Dr. C. B. Williams; Reason and Fallacy in the Study of Fossil Man, by Prof. LeGros Clark; The Relief of Pain, by Dr. P. O. Wolff and Mr. J. B. Pennybacker; Whaling, by Mr. Robert Clarke; Forest Economics and Forest Policy, by Mr. W. E. Hiley; and Conjecture and Risk, by Prof. John Cohen.

To readers of this journal the most interesting article will be that on Science and Religion by Prof. C. A. Coulson. This eminent physicist gives a critical survey of the relationships between science and religion during the past century or so, shows how each has of necessity tended to become less assertive and dogmatic, and indicates why so many modern scientists find that theistic or at least deistic ideas have a necessary place in their scheme of things. Prof. Coulson himself is definitely a theist, and accepts the claims and lordship of Jesus Christ. Rather than a number of snippets, let me quote the fine words with which his address ended: "Not until man's patient observation of the world around has led him on to awe and then to worship; not until our science has shown us with what rich lustre the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows His handiwork; not until then can human faith be as it was meant to be, nor human life fulfil its proper destiny; nor shall we see how all things are summed up in Christ, both things on earth and things in Heaven; and our hearts be so astonished at the splendour of God's creation that they grasp eternity in a moment of time, and are lost in wonder, love and praise."

A. R. VINE.

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

The Vision and Mission of Jesus. By A. H. Curtis. 388 pp. T. & T. Clark. 27s.

This examination of the Baptism and Temptation narratives and their O.T. background really covers a much wider range and becomes an exposition of the purpose of Jesus. It has a devotional rather than an academic quality, and is best described as a series of reflections on the meaning of Jesus' human experience understood as typical of the experience of the true disciple. The history of the Church in the world shows how little this lesson has been learnt, and how much the missionary incentive has been misunderstood. Temptation and trial are essential for the fulness of faith. Some of the author's motives provoke dissent (e.g., the Devil as God's instrument in promoting faith, 146 ff., or Christ's treatment of Judas, 312 ff.), but that is forgiveable in a book which contains so many real insights. Our chief criticism arises from Mr. Curtis's prolixity both of thought and style. This work might have been more effective if published as two smaller books; and most of his Ciceronian sentences would gain in perspicuity if reduced to half their length. E. C. Blackman.

Life Together. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. 112 pp. S.C.M. 4s. 6d.

The story of Dr. Bonhoeffer is well-known. He was a victim of Nazi persecution, but even under imprisonment he kept a serene spirit and preserved the sense of the presence of God. This little book is the fruit of his meditations in those dreadful days and it is radiant with Christian grace and peace. There are five sections—"Community", "The day with others", "The day alone", "Ministry", and "Confession and Communion" —all of them profound yet practical guides to the spiritual life. He is well aware of the peculiar temptations that wait even upon sanctity. "Seek God", he says, "not happiness. This is the fundamental rule of all meditation". This is a book of which Bacon would have said "it is to be read wholly and with diligence and attention". A. V. Murray.

The Eyelids of the Dawn. By Jack Winslow. 192 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

This readable book is difficult to classify; it consists of the author's memories, reflections and hopes; and since he has lived a full and interesting life, which has been spent in a variety of Christian service, its simple, ambling narrative has the value of testimony as well as the quality of charm. Winslow, who traces his ancestry to a Pilgrim Father, Edward Winslow, of Droitwich, went to Eton in 1895 and left Oxford in 1905. He has a good story to tell of that period of his life, though not all the anecdotes are new; but it is with the second and third parts of his book that most readers will be chiefly concerned. He went to India in 1914, just before the first World War, and there became the founder of the first of the Christian "Ashrams". During this period of his life he was in close touch with Ghandi, C. F. Andrews, E. J. Palmer and Narayan Vaman Tilak. All this deserves the close attention of all who seek to understand the work of the Church overseas. Shortly before his work in India came to an end, Winslow came under Buchmanite influence. This evidently led him into a more vital experience of the Gospel. Since his return to this country, the author's two chief

pieces of work have been the chaplaincy of Bryanston School and later of Lee Abbey in North Devon, where he has been associated with the work of Roger de Pemberton.

The bare outline of a *curriculum vitae* cannot possibly convey the colour, texture and quality of a man's life; but those who read this book will have their reward in coming to know a man whose faith is enviably vital. There are indeed judgments which few will accept; many will think his judgment of Ghandi over-simplified, and still more will cavil at his appreciation of M.R.A.; but when all that has been said, those who want to break a lance here and there with Winslow had better ask themselves, as the reviewer has done, whether their awareness of and trust in the grace and power of God is of like quality to his. JOHN HUXTABLE.

Sing with the Understanding. By G. R. BALLEINE. 224 pp. Independent Press. 10s. 6d.

The sub-title of this book is 'Some hymn problems unravelled', and the intention there indicated is to help the singer of hymns to understand what he is saying while he sings, rather than to acquaint him with the history of hymnody. This is a praiseworthy aim which the author achieves with distinction. He takes 33 well-known hymns and devotes the greater part of the chapter allotted to each hymn to an exposition of its contents. This is preceded by a note on the historical context of the hymn, and followed by some observations on the tune or tunes usually associated with it. The author lets each hymn tell its own tale; he expounds Muirhead's 'The Church of God a Kingdom is', for example, by referring it to Van Eyck's picture, 'The Adoration of the Lamb', which is included as a frontispiece to the book. On the *Veni Creator* he devotes himself to doctrine, and to telling us Who precisely the Holy Ghost is, and what are His 'sevenfold gifts'. Each hymn has some treasure below the surface which Mr. Balleine brings to light by the use of his considerable historical erudition and dogmatic insight. There are misprints on pp. 116 ('Barrington' for 'Burrington'), 135 (*Proprior Deo*) and 155 (*Downham* College, Cambridge), and slight errors have crept in on pp. 141 and 166 in notes on tunes. But the commendable thing is that the book urges the singer to take trouble over his text, rather than to adopt that offensively contemptuous attitude to archaisms and Biblicisms which is so commonly to be found among hymn-singers. As an introduction to the technique of 'singing with the understanding' it is much to be praised. All but three of the hymns here dealt with are in *Congregational Praise*. ERIK ROUTLEY.

Religious Education in Schools. A report published for the Institute of Christian Education. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

A Bibliography for the Use of Teachers of Religious Knowledge. Compiled by the Institute of Christian Education. 4th revised edition, 1954. The Religious Education Press. 2s. 6d.

The Institute of Christian Education is a body which brings together teachers, parents, parsons, administrators and those who have a keen amateur interest in religious education. It is a most useful body, especially in these days when religious education is a statutory part of the syllabus of maintained and aided schools and there is still very little practical knowledge of how to deal with it properly. Among the useful services rendered by the Institute has been the preparation of annotated bibliographies of which the 1954 edition is the fourth. It has expanded from a sixpenny pamphlet to a booklet of over fifty pages and is the best thing of its kind that I know.

The Report on Religious Education is a quarto book of 157 pages and is altogether a most useful document. It is concerned with the implementing of the religious education section of the Act of 1944 chiefly through the use of Agreed Syllabuses of which there are now more than fifty. It provides the complete answer to the ignoramus who believes that nothing is being done and also to the other type who believes that what is being done is not worth doing. The Act has now been in operation for ten years and it is most illuminating to see with what courage and goodwill this hitherto thorny subject has been treated in the schools. The Report is heavily factual, as it ought to be, and we have chapters on the organization of teaching, the content of the syllabuses, the question of specialization, sixth-form work, corporate worship, equipment and, in fact, every aspect of religious education in schools as it is now carried on. It is a most heartening document and every minister and teacher ought to read it.

A. V. Murray.

The Christians' God, by Stephen Neill. **Christian Giving,** by V. S. Azariah. United Society for Christian Literature. 2s. each.

These are the first two titles in a new series designed for world-wide circulation. The aim is to provide a number of texts in English suitable for translation into many of the languages spoken in Africa and the East. By this means it is hoped to supply pastors and teachers in the younger Churches with books on basic matters of Christian faith and life. The aim of the publishers should commend itself to all thoughtful Christians.

To write a book on *The Christians' God* in 89 pages without oversimplification or vagueness would be a considerable feat. On the whole Bishop Neill has been very successful. He presents God as Life, Light, Love and Spirit, and ends with a short chapter on the Trinity. He is particularly helpful on the last subject, which he approaches from the experiential rather than the intellectual angle. I found the comparison between the beliefs of the Christian and the Unitarian particularly useful. I have one criticism to make on a point of detail. On page 30 he gives π as the example of something unchanging. Will this mean anything to an African or Indian pastor? Or is mathematics part of the *praeparatio evangelica*?

This is a useful book which should meet a need in this country as well as abroad.

The late Dr. Azariah, of Dornakal, was the first Indian to become an Anglican bishop. He was an austere, saintly man who dealt much more sternly with the Indian Church than any missionary could dare to do. This book of his on *Christian Giving* speaks with directness and authority. He exposes the causes of inadequate giving, works out from Scripture the basis of true giving and outlines our Lord's teaching about money. He goes to the root of the matter when he says that many Christians do not give their money to God because they have not first given themselves. He brings the wisdom of the Christian East to the exposition of Scripture, and the result is a most searching book.

Born Catholics. Assembled by F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 238 pp. 12s. 6d.

To the outsider the Roman Catholic Church presents the appearance of a massive politico-religious institution, seeking and using power to further its own ends. How different it looks from the inside, appears from this book of essays contributed by 19 'born Catholics'. To them the Church is not an institution, but a mother. Some can see no wrong in her. Others, more clearsighted, see her faults but love her none the less. Many contributors glory in their freedom within an ordered system of dogmas. They are

like children playing in a large and fascinating walled garden. They don't worry about the walls. They may even like the security they give. But they are there nevertheless. Very hard. Very high.

No one could fail to be moved by the sincerity of these writers. What is so interesting is that often what they prize most is simply Christian. They do not realize apparently that they might have had the same experience in other branches of the Church. "We have discovered that faith is not simply assent to a creed, but fidelity to a person" (p. 21) might have been written by a Protestant Evangelical. This is a most interesting collection of human documents, some of them very well written.

An Approach to the New Testament. By Greville P. Lewis. 272 pp. Epworth, 10s. 6d.

This is a text-book prepared with the avowed intention of helping Methodist Local Preachers in their studies. It begins with a historical introduction linking the Old and New Testaments. Next follow sketches of the political and religious background of the New Testament. At the beginning of each Gospel Mr. Lewis writes notes on authorship, sources and special features. He groups the material in each Gospel and comments briefly upon it. Like so many textbooks, this one has no beauty that we should desire it; but it should prove useful.

The Best of A. E. Whitham (Epworth, 8s. 6d., 151 pp.) is good indeed. Sometimes his sentences are long and involved, but that is because the words pour like a stream in spate from a soul overflowing with the love of God. Even if I had not read in the biographical note that "there was in him a beautiful blend of goodness and gaiety" I would have gathered as much from the contents and style of these articles and sermons. There is sweetness and light here, and a deep devotion to Jesus Christ.

Addresses in a very different style are collected in *The Lord is King* by Stanley K. Bridge (Epworth, 6s., 67 pp.). Originally delivered in B.B.C. services, they must have been very effective radio as they are simple and adequately illustrated. The Methodist Church lost a gifted minister by Mr. Bridge's untimely death. A misprint in line 10, page 47, spoils a well-known story about Carlyle.

Another Epworth publication, *The Sixth Homely Year* by Ida and Leslie Church (6s., 127 pp.) is a charming anthology with a verse or paragraph for every day in the year. It has 15 full-page illustrations.

In *Hymns that Came to Life* (Epworth, 5s., 64 pp.) H. L. Gee gives more than a score of stories to show how hymns have influenced, strengthened or converted many. Mr. Gee writes vividly and hits off character and situation in a few sentences. I am not surprised to learn from the publisher's blurb that the sales of his Epworth Press books alone run into three-quarters of a million. He has the authentic Light Programme touch.

Called to be Saints by Doris M. Whitney (Independent Press, 6s., 127 pp.) is a collection of addresses for women's meetings. They are Biblical, practical and homely, and should prove useful to those who have to speak to such meetings. "She could not have done it on two people's rations" is a line which betrays the time when it was written!

Seven Steeples by Margaret K. Henrichsen (Epworth, 10s. 6d., 238 pp.) I found difficult to lay down after I had once started it. Mrs. Henrichsen tells the story of how, after becoming a widow, she found a new life as the minister of village churches in Maine. She writes with tenderness of an American scene far removed from Main Street or McCarthyism. Love for men and women and delight in flowers and birds breathes from every page. She makes the little white-washed churches very real to us, and brings before our eyes many simple but interesting people. Mrs. Henrichsen

knows the deep satisfactions of the pastor who sees men and women growing in grace, and feels the constant tension, known to every minister, between the claims of people and the claims of study and prayer.

This is a delightful book, but it is also challenging. If one woman plus a car can minister to seven village churches in Maine, why do not the English churches use more women (and cars) to serve rural communities?

CHARLES HAIG.

The Tip-Top Annual (Epworth Press, 6s.) is excellent for children aged 5-8 years. Along with the usual legends, fairy and nature stories, there is the Story of Joseph in cartoon and 25 pp. of really useful "Bob and Betty in Bibleland".

Not the least interesting thing about *The Saving Name* by Hedley Hodkin (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.) is its origin. The book consists of articles that have appeared in a parish magazine. Both for their matter and for their style they well deserved to appear in this more permanent form. The reader finds something fresh said about Hymns, Collections, Sermons, Spiritual Healing, Marriage, Providence, the Jews, all said in an arresting way.

There must be something in the air of Australia, for F. W. Boreham's successor comes from Boreham's own adopted country. *Wind in The Tree Tops* by T. Howard Crago (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.) has the same freshness and readability as marked almost everything by that veteran essayist. Here are the same sort of titles, A Philosophy of Blowflies, A Salesman's Secret, and The Patchwork Quilt. Here is the same power of wide-ranging quotation. Here is the gift of seeing all things summed up in Christ.

Radiant Religion is a title well describing the contents of a book by George Artingstall (Epworth Press, 5s.). The fifteen chapters are sermons marked by Methodist fervour and faith. Slips, pardonable in the spoken word, have been allowed to pass into print. Missionary *Moffat* is mis-spelled; William Tyndale was not burned *alive;* and T. R. Glover did not say that the Christian Church *out-loved* the pagan world.

The Salvationist and His Leisure by F. L. Coutts (Salvationist Press, Paper, 1s.) is a slight treatment of a profoundly important subject, the face of which has changed since the early days of the Army. There is now more leisure and there are more ways of filling it. The need of a reassessment is realized and also the difficulty of finding fixed criteria of what is and what is not permissible. Drink, gambling, blood-sports, films, wireless, television, smoking, the use of Sunday, and what is reasonable expenditure on recreation, are all discussed. By a notable omission there is nothing about reading and nothing about gardening.

The Soldier's Armoury is the title of a paper-covered pocket book giving a list of daily Bible Readings with Notes, issued by the Salvationist Press (1s. 4d.). It covers a six months course and the Notes are first-class.

Company Orders and Bible Class Notes for Young People (Salvation Army International H.Q., 3s.) is a volume of Lesson Helps for 1955. Sound in method and manner, it is as good as anything of its kind.

The White Castle (Salvationist Press, Paper, 1s. 9d., Cloth 3s.) by Cyril J. Barnes is a most readable biography of Mary Lictenberger. She was born in Belgrade, the daughter of a B.F.B.S. colporteur: she ends up a Major in the Salvation Army in Canada working in the interests of immigrants. Here is a worthwhile Sunday School prize.

A shorter *Pilgrim's Progress* for children was a good idea. To present the substance of the book in the Five to Ten devotional interlude in the Light Programme was also good. Those wanting Bunyan thus rewritten

have it in printed form in *Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress at Five to Ten* by D. H. Barber (Mowbrays, Paper, 3s. 6d.).

The Adventure of Life by The Skipper (Carwal Ltd., Paper, 1s. 6d.) is a miscellany of advice to young people setting out into life. The tone is heartily avuncular.

Ken, Candy and the Castle Secret by Millicent I. Thomas (Epworth Press, 5s.) has in it all the ingredients, properly mixed: an island, a castle, a cliff, a cave, a mystery. With that a story could hardly go wrong.

The Chosen Nation by Elsie Broadie (R.E.P., 5s. boards, 4s. duxeen) is the first of a three-volume History of Israel for the 13-16 age group. It is by no means easy to write such a book. To discuss fully the doubtful issues, and they are many, is to leave the pupil fogged; to make no more than a simple statement is to risk the challenge of the informed reader. Miss Broadie has often chosen to run that risk: and it was the wiser thing to do. Teachers will be grateful for this new tool.

The Sun in our House by Marjorie Wilkinson (Epworth, 5s.) takes its title from a saying of St. Theresa. Into seven chapters there are collected stories of those who have reflected the light of God's glory in radiant lives. The first chapter, headed "The Gift of the Light" points us in rapid succession to Kingsley, Elizabeth Fry, Jane Addams, Pascal, Sir T. More, St. Thomas, Wesley and St. Augustine. And that is a fair sample.

Bible in Brazil is a fascinating booklet by C. H. Morris (B.F.B.S., paper, 1s. 6d.). This nation with the fourth largest territory has a population of 53 million, of whom seventy per cent are illiterate. It offers a vast and varied field for the colporteur. It now has its own Bible Society which in its first three years has circulated 44 million copies of Scripture. Mr. Morris has a heartening story to tell and he tells it well.

Through the Year with Wesley (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.) is an anthology compiled by F. C. Gill. It is good to possess, and even better to give away to a discerning friend. The compiler deserves our grateful thanks, not least for his extreme modesty. He even denies himself a foreword wherein he might have told us how he came by so excellent an idea, how much reading its fulfilment involved and how much valuable material he had reluctantly to leave out. Having much, one is apt to want more.

As in Adam (Mowbray, 6s.) is by "A Religious of the C.S.M.V." It carries a sub-title "A Study in the Church."

It is a product of that new Rabbinism which is beginning to infect Biblical studies. The fatal word comes out on p. 46, "typikos". It is taken as justification for believing that all that happened in the Creation narratives of Genesis happened again in the Coming, Death and Resurrection of our Lord. There is a stretching and straining after parallels, a combination of learning and fantasy which makes one long for another Luther to cut through its tortuous mythology and to proclaim salvation by faith-trust in the Lord Jesus Christ alone. Surely such complicated guesswork is clean contrary to the simplicities of the Gospels.

The Puppetry Year Book (Carwal Ltd., Wallington, Surrey, 5s.) is just the book for the devotees of this ancient art. It is full of information and has excellent articles and illustrations. Even the advertisements are fascinating.

The Life to Come by Stephen Hobhouse (Independent Press, 6s.) has an admirable purpose, "to extend our field of hopes and expectations some way into the unseen regions which lie on the other side of death". Everything depends on the methods by which the author pursues his purpose. Caution is aroused immediately it is admitted that the information given by

Scripture is scanty and remains "unsatisfying to many of us". Indeed, there paths begin to part. What other and better source of information is there? One would have thought that the assurance, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him", was rich and definite enough for any man. Those who must go further enter on dangerous paths, and this Mr. Hobhouse does with his tentative acceptance of the unreliable evidence of spiritualism and much else that is sheer imagination. For example, what do we make of this? "Both reason and the evidence of psychic communication suggest that the eternal human form will appear [in heaven] as that of the man or woman at the prime of life, say between 25 and 30 years of age." Reason suggests no such a thing. Can we not be satisfied that after death we and our loved ones are "with Christ" and that to know that is enough?

Living the Infinite Way by Joel S. Goldsmith (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is a further dose of theosophical word-spinning. Turning aside from what it calls "orthodox and theological teachings", it offers salvation by enlightenment which is neither new nor specifically Christian. The book does contain this bit of useful information: Why are Arabian horses the best? "When a mare is in foal, a man reads to her from the Koran, the Mohammedan Bible. That is the reason for the superior quality of the Arabian horse."

The King of the Creek (B.F.B.S., 3s. 6d.) is wonderful value. Here are eighteen splendid Christian stories for youngsters, set in all the varied parts of the world. They first appeared in *For Every Land,* the children's Magazine of the British and Foreign Bible Society. It is to be hoped that they will have a wider circulation in their new form.

JOHN WILDING.

In the Speedwell series of plays comes a welcome addition in a short one-act play, *Jairus* by T. A. Dewing (Independent Press, 1s.), welcome because it has a general appeal and is not confined to one special season of the Christian year. As its title suggests, it centres upon the healing of Jairus's daughter. The characters are sympathetically drawn, and among the Temple rulers differing viewpoints towards Jesus and the Law are given dramatic emphasis. The charm of the play, however, lies mainly in the blend into the main action of other people from the Gospels, including the man with the withered hand, the woman who touched the Lord's robe, and the crippled man made to walk. Easy to produce, the play lasts half an hour.

The Religious Education Press offer two new pieces for Christmas. First, *The King is Born* by S. T. Hartshorne, a straightforward play on the Nativity introducing every relevant incident in a dignified but simple presentation. At times the dialogue is too stilted, too literary, and one might criticize the alteration in familiar original words. This play was used by the B.B.C. in Children's Hour, Christmas, 1953, which may account for its wordiness, the fault of many plays designed for sound radio. About an hour's duration, with a cast of thirteen, the play is suitable for senior children, and copies are 1s. 6d. each. Secondly, a pageant, *This Festival* by Geraldine Middleton, more in the form of an illustrated sermon, illustrated by carols and solo players on some aspect of Christmas, and concluding with a Nativity tableau. Simple to present, it would be helpful in many churches and Sunday Schools. Copies cost 6d. each.

ROBERT DUCE.

The Rev. D. P. Thomson, Evangelism Organizer for the Church of Scotland, has produced three useful little booklets on method: *You are Going out Visiting?* (3d.), *Guidance for Those Engaged on House-to-House Visitation Campaigns* (3d.) and *Two By Two* (6d.). They are published by the author at Barnoak, Crieff, Perthshire.

Prayer and the Life of the Spirit by Frederick J. Tritton (Friends' Home Service Committee, 1s. 6d.) is a wise little book on personal prayer life.

A doctor writes wisely on a pressing practical problem in *The Meaning of Faith in Faith-Healing* (by D. V. Martin, Epworth Press, 1s.).

From the Concert of Europe to the United Nations is the Burge Memorial Lecture for 1954, delivered by Lord Percy of Newcastle (S.C.M., 1s.).

Oxford University Press is publishing, at 1s. 6d. each, a useful series *Lives of Great Men and Women.* They are by Norman Wymer; each book is 32 pp., illustrated, well written and factually reliable. They should specially appeal to late teenagers, but can equally be commended to anyone wanting concise knowledge of these notable people. The first eight are entitled *Dr. Arnold of Rugby, Elizabeth Fry, Dr. Barnardo, Florence Nightingale, Sir Robert Peel, Sir Rowland Hill, Robert Owen, Lord Shaftesbury.*

The Church of Scotland has issued a revised edition of the *Ordinal and Service Book for Use in Courts of the Church,* which was first published in 1931. The new edition comes from the Oxford University Press at 8s. 6d. It will be of service not only to Presbyterians, but to all students of liturgy who wish to study or adopt its balanced and dignified orders.

The Kingdom of God (Independent Press, 1s.) contains B.B.C. "Lift up Your Hearts" talks by Principal John Huxtable.

Private Prayer: Suggestions and Helps (Independent Press, 9d.) is in its tenth printing. Compiled by Dr. A. H. Gray and the Rev. Geo. Barclay, it gives scripture readings and other helps toward making private prayer purposeful and effectual.

In *Methodism in Relation to Protestant Tradition* (Epworth, 1s. 6d.) the Rev. E. Gordon Rupp sets out with scholarly incisiveness the significance of historic and modern Methodism. A sobering corrective to too easy ecumenicity.

The Annual Lecture of the Evangelical Library for 1954 was a study of the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy, *The Sure Mercies of David,* by F. F. Bruce. It is obtainable from the Library, 78a, Chiltern Street, London, W.1. Price not stated.

The Faith of the Bible in the World Today is a lecture by Dr. H. G. Wood, published by the Friends' Home Service Committee at 9d.

Tyndale Echoes (Arrowsmith, Bristol, 5s.) consist of short quotations and epigrams from the sermons of the late Dr. Richard Glover, edited by his daughter.

MISCELLANEA

Spare the Rod. By MICHAEL CROFT. 266 pp. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

' "Worrell Street" is an imaginary school' says the preface, but the picture drawn of it is a true one for all that. This is a first novel in a double sense, the first of its author and the first story about a Modern School.

The Modern School is the chief visible product of the 1944 Act. It is an experiment, in its early stages, and may not last. Not because the idea is wrong or does not work; on the contrary there are some quite excellent Modern Schools, probably in our own district, schools with good premises, keen teachers, new methods and freedom to discard tradition. But the experiment may be killed by either of its two formidable enemies, snobbery or economy. It is looked down upon; many parents regard it as a disgrace if their child cannot secure a Grammar School place. It is thought of as a school for those who are not bright. It was intended for something very different: a school for those who are not bookish. Such schools are costly, and we may have to stop building, or even adequately converting older schools. Just as there are some very good Modern Schools, so there are some very bad ones, schools that are little more than the old elementary school under a new name, creamed of their brighter children and where the parents have a large say, even in matters of corporal punishment and homework, schools where modern jargon (project method and the like) goes along with failure to teach even the Three R's. This is a story about such a school, and I do not find the picture overdrawn. A pupil of mine teaching in one very similar to 'Worrell St.' paints an even grimmer picture. If the old book called 'The Dark Places in English Education' were brought up to date, there should be a chapter about such places, about the strain we put on our teachers when we raised the school age instead of reducing the size of classes. It is time we thought more about those teachers, about the young ex-service idealist in his first job whose real shock is not the children, nor the parents, but the staff:

> "It seemed there was no hatred in their attitude, even as there was no love. They were disappointed, embittered people for whom the strain had been too great. Standing before forty and fifty children at a time, of all kinds, the docile, the abandoned, the uncouth, the imbecile, year after year, week after week, struggling, scolding, suffering, seeking to leaven the mass, to salvage some serviceable bark from the vast wreck, had numbed and eaten their vitality and destroyed their vision" (p. 96).

Some of our church members are living out their discipleship in that kind of atmosphere. Could we not do more to help them? Is is not time that we stopped thinking of 'religious instruction' as the chief Free Church interest in education, and looked rather at the paganism implicit in the whole system, a system where the weight of numbers crushes ingenuity, where prayers are perfunctory because the great thing, the only thing, is to keep order at all costs? Read how in this book the school was stopped three times in the recital of the Creed because of bad behaviour. Imagination, individuality, poetry, enthusiasm, there is no time for these things in much English education today: "I don't care what methods you use with them," the Head continued, "so long as you hold them down" (p. 12).

W. G. MOORE.

An English version of Dr. Albert Schweitzer's Nobel Peace Prize address, delivered in Oslo last November, has now been published under the title *The Problem of Peace in the World of Today* (A. & C. Black, 1s. 6d.). This address has aroused profound interest throughout the free world, rather, it may be supposed, on account of the example and authority of the speaker than from any hope that he would provide an original answer to this problem. Towards the end of his address Schweitzer himself admits to being "well aware that there is nothing essentially new in what I have been saying". Briefly, he believes in the possibility of a change of mind and heart in individuals, and therefore in nations, which could ensure the peace of the world. It is his faith rather than his doctrine that is impressive.

For the facts and for practical suggestions based upon the facts we shall do better to turn to Mr. Edward Rogers' *Programme for Peace* (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.). This pamphlet consists of articles reprinted from the *Methodist Recorder* and is well calculated to fulfil its purpose, to "stimulate Christian thinking and stir the Christian conscience to action". As the author well says in his statement of the problem: "The time for decision is so short that evading decision is itself decision".

The Numbered Days (S.C.M., 9s. 6d.) is a group of expository essays originally preached as sermons by Mr. Stuart B. Jackman, minister of Pretoria Congregational Church. The book puts the problematical situation in South Africa today into the context of the Christian faith as it is revealed to us in the Bible. It is written "in the conviction that there are no political solutions; that the sickness of South Africa is a sickness of the spirit, and that only God, in His mercy and wisdom, can bring us healing". The situation, according to these pages, is indeed desperate, not only politically. South African Congregationalism is facing the greatest crisis of its history. Of the two ways open to it at this juncture—to turn Presbyterian or "to think of Congregationalism in quite different terms, and be prepared to make widespread changes in . . . . churchmanship and policy"—the author is convinced that the second, the way of Lot moving out of Sodom into the little city, is the right one to take. He therefore urges his fellow-worshippers to prepare for a time when "groups and cells of Christian people will meeet together as and when they can", to make ready, in short, for a return to the conditions, and still more the spirit, of primitive Christianity.

In *In Spite of Dungeons* (Hodder and Stoughton, 12s. 6d.) the Rev. S. J. Davies, M.B.E., the sole military chaplain to survive the ordeal of captivity by Chinese Communists, relates his experiences as a prisoner of war in North Korea. Mr. Davies, who was attached to the famous Gloucestershire Regiment, was captured after the battle of the Imjin River, of which he gives a vivid account. He was a prisoner for two and a half years, condemned part of the time to solitary confinement in a filthy cell for his "illegal religious activities and hostile attitude". With notable absence of rancour he describes the horrors, hardships and humours of camp life in the rigorous climate of the Manchurian border. The book is illustrated with photographs and sketches. There is a useful endpaper map.

Mr. Augustus Muir's *Candlelight in Avalon* (Bles, 15s.) is the intimate journal of one Hugh Occleve, a solicitor. Having suffered a nervous breakdown, Occleve spends the better part of a year recuperating in a friend's house in the country. His diary kept during this period is concerned with such diverse topics as books and food, friends and neighbours, sex and sin. But above all it is a moral exercise. It tells of the diarist's struggle to regain his own soul and of his failure to do so until he surrenders himself unconditionally to God. In spite of the editorial comments and the biographical introduction, ostensibly contributed by a friend of the diarist, there can be

little doubt that this work should be classed as fiction rather than as biography. It is none the worse for that.

The latest additions to the Sheldonian English Series are *Tennyson* and *Periodical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, presented respectively by Miss Hester Burton and Mr. J. A. Stone (O.U.P., 6s. each). Within its limits Miss Burton's commentary on Tennyson could hardly be bettered. "Not to read Tennyson's poetry aloud is almost as self-denying as to read a sonata of Beethoven without playing it". It is ungenerous to find fault with so discriminating an anthology, but surely any selection from Tennyson should include all or part of 'Audley Court'? The thirty essays chosen by Mr. Stone from the periodical writings of Addison, Steele, Goldsmith and Johnson effectively illustrate the quality and characteristics of the best work of the first great age of English journalism. The purpose of the brief editorial comments, biographical, historical and critical, is to help the reader to enjoy the essays as literature, not to instruct him.

The altarpiece of 'The Adoration of the Lamb' in the Cathedral Church of St. Bavon at Ghent is one of the great masterpieces of painting. For five centuries it was generally believed that this work had been begun by Hubert van Eyck and completed by Jan van Eyck, his brother, by 6th May, 1432. In *The Van Eyck Problem* (Chatto and Windus, 10s. 6d.) Mr. Maurice W. Brockwell proves that no such person as Hubert van Eyck ever existed, that he is a myth, and that the Ghent altarpiece was exclusively the work of Jan. It is with something of the excitement inspired by a well-told detective story that we follow Mr. Brockwell's account of the origin, growth and gradual decline of this legend. Although the facts in the case were known to experts as far back as 1933, only *Larousse* among current reference books acknowledges them. P. A. SPALDING.

The Science of Petroleum, Vol. V, Part II. Synthetic Products of Petroleum. B. T. BROOKS and A. E. DUNSTAN, editors. 329 pp. O.U.P. 100s.

In 1938 the Oxford University Press published in four large volumes what might then have been regarded as a definitive treatise on *The Science of Petroleum*. Those volumes are still indispensable to the petroleum technologist; but they are now being supplemented by two new volumes, each in several parts, designed to bring into account the considerable advances of the war and post-war years. The present volume deals with synthetic products and refinery processes. The great advances in distillation, refining, cracking and dewaxing are fully described, and there is full treatment of the range of petroleum synthetics, including synthetic rubber. More than fifty American and British experts have collaborated, and the resultant work is exhaustive and technically authoritative. The book is fully illustrated with photographs and diagrams, and the pages, which are 11″ by 8″, average over 1,200 words. It is a bigger book than 329 pages suggests. Typography is excellent, and almost free from errors. I notice a dropped carbon link on p. 32. A. R. VINE.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (Jan.) includes 'Mithraism and its Challenge to Christianity', by Prof. S. G. F. Brandon; 'The Riddles of Josephus' by Dr. Roderic Dunkerley; 'Divine Omnipotence and Human Freedom' by Prof. Antony Flew; 'Truth or the Shut Door' by Dr. C. J. Wright; 'The Challenge of Contemporary Philosophy to Religion' by O. Roger Jones.

International Review of Missions (Jan.) has the indispensible 'Survey of the Year' by Miss Margaret Sinclair (81 pages); 'Evanston and the World Mission of the Church' by Dr. Norman Goodall; 'Christ, the Hope of Asia' by Dr. E. C. Bhatty; 'South Africa: the Bantu Education Act' by Rev. N. Blamires.

Scottish Journal of Theology (Dec.) has 'Bultmann's Estimate of Jesus' by Prof. Allan Barr; 'The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought' by Prof. John McIntyre; 'Doing over a Liturgy' by Prof. J. R. MacPhail of the Church of South India; 'The Reformation of Worship' by Rev. D. H. C. Read.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Jan.) includes articles on the stewardship of money by Dr. W. J. Lofthouse, Rev. E. Rogers, Rev. J. P. K. Byrnes; 'The Protestant Principle' by Dr. E. L. Allen; 'Hilaire Belloc' by W. S. Handley Jones.

The Preacher's Quarterly (Dec.) edited by Dr. J. Alan Kay is a promising newcomer meant 'solely and specifically for the preacher' issued by The Epworth Press at 3s. 6d. We welcome and commend an excellent first number.

Church Quarterly Review (Jan.-March) prints 'Creation', "a dialogue of elucidation" between Prof. D. M. MacKinnon and Prof. A. G. N. Flew, broadcast on the B.B.C. Third Programme; 'The New Philosophy and the Divines' by Meyrick H. Carre; 'Mythology and the Incarnation' by Robert Leaney; 'A Church in Action' by Rt. Rev. L. S. Hunter.

Modern Churchman (Dec.) includes 'The Problem of Religious Knowledge' by Very Rev. W. R. Mathews; 'Unattached Christians' by Rev. H. C. Snape; 'Liberalism against the Stream' by Rev. C. O. Rhodes.

Theology (Dec.) includes 'Women and the Ministry' by Ven. G. F. Hilder. (Jan.) 'Has "Biblical Theology" Served its Turn?' by Rev. B. M. G. Reardon.

Expository Times (Dec.) includes 'Ernst Percy's *Message and Mission of Jesus*' by Dr. Matthew Black; 'Human Relationships in an Expanding Community' by Rev. W. Y. Batley. (Jan.) 'Harnack's *Das Wesen Des Christentums*' by Rev. G. V. Jones; 'The Origin of the Book of Amos' by Dr. John D. W. Watts; 'Existentialism and the Christian Faith' by Rev. B. M. G. Reardon.

Review of Religion (Nov.) includes 'Sketch of a Philosophy of Joy' by Zakaria Ibrahim Boctor; 'Growth in the Study of Religion at Columbia University, 1924-54' by the editor, Prof. Horace L. Friess; Reviews and Book Notes (60 pages).

Huntington Library Quarterly (Nov.) includes 'The Death of a Queen; Spenser's Dido as Elizabeth' by Prof. Paul E. McLane; 'Benlowes, Marvell, and the Divine Casimire' by Maren-Sofie Rostvig; 'Background for Repression' by James Morton Smith; 'Bret Harte and the Indians of Northern California' by Prof. Margaret Duckett.

The Yale Review (Winter) includes 'The United States and China', two articles by Prof. H. Arthur Steiner and Prof. Hardy Cross Dillard; 'Strings on Economic Aid' by Willard L. Thorpe; 'McCarthyism: a Sociologist's View' by Prof. Talcott Parsons; 'Churchill and the Limitations of Myth' by Reed Whittemore.

Interpretation, whose emphasis is on Biblical theology (Oct.) includes 'Orthodox Proclamation' by Prof. Eduard Schweizer; 'Human Rights in Israel's Thought' by Alfred Bloom; 'The Book of Ezekiel' by Prof. David Noel Freedman.

Theology Today (Jan.) includes 'After Evanston, What?' by Prof. E. V. Devadutt; 'Christians, but not quite' by Dr. Theo. P. Ferris; 'From the Father and the Son: the Filioque after 900 years' by Prof. G. S. Hendry; 'Does Spiritual Faith ensure Physical Benefits?' by Prof. G. Runkle; 'The Power of the Spiritual Life' by Prof. Otto Piper; three articles on 'The Main Issues in Theological Education' by Profs. Richard Niebuhr, Day Williams, James M. Gustafson.

The Rationalist Annual, 1955 (2s. 6d.), is worth reading, if only to know what is being said by those one disagrees with, but who share some of our interests. It includes 'The Origin of Purpose' by J. B. S. Haldane; 'Durkheim's Theory of Religion' by M. Ginsberg; 'Darwin's Place among the Philosophers' by Sir A. Keith; 'The Third Maxim' by Antony Flew; 'Aesthetic Experience and the Problem of Evil' by Margaret Knight; 'Religion and the Physicists' by E. H. Hutten. There is little help on the major problems of the day. J. M. P.